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1.1 New Theories about Human Development

Since the 1950s, theories about life among early humans have centered on “traditional” male and female roles, with men responsible for hunting and women for domestic duties and child rearing. In the following excerpt, Barbara Ehrenreich reviews new developments in the theories about the origins of human evolution that challenge these traditional views.


There were always plenty of prima facie reasons to doubt the Mr. and Mrs. Man-the-Hunter version of our collective biography, such as the little matter of size, or, in science-speak, “sexual dimorphism.” If men and women evolved so differently, then why aren’t men a whole lot bigger than they are? In fact, humans display a smaller size disparity between the sexes than do many of our ape cousins—suggesting (though not proving) that early men and women sometimes had overlapping job descriptions, like having to drive off the leopards. And speaking of Paleolithic predators, wouldn’t it be at least unwise for the guys to go off hunting, leaving the supposedly weak and dependent women and children to fend for themselves at base camp? Odd too, that Paleolithic culture should look so much like the culture of Levittown circa 1955, with the gals waiting at home for the guys to come back with the bacon. In what other carnivorous species is only one sex an actual predator?

Beginning in the ‘70s, women began to elbow their way into the field and develop serious alternatives to the old, male-centered theory of human evolution. It shouldn’t matter, of course, what sex the scientist is, but women had their own reasons for being suspicious of the dominant paradigm. The first revisionist blow came in the mid-‘70s, when anthropologists Adrienne Zihlman and Nancy Tanner pointed out that among surviving “hunting” peoples, most of the community’s calories—up to 70%—come from plant food patiently gathered by women, not meat heroically captured by men. The evidence for Stone Age consumption of plant foods has mounted since then. In 1994 paleobotanist Sarah Mason concluded that a variety of plant material discovered at the Paleolithic site of Dolni Vestonice in the Czech Republic was in fact edible roots and seeds. At the very least, it seems, the Paleolithic dinner was potluck, and it was probably the women who provided most of the starches, salad and raspberry-mousse desserts. The mother-of-us-all was beginning to look a little peppy and more self-reliant.

Not that even the most efficient gatherer gal doesn’t need a little help now and then, especially when she’s lactating. Nursing a baby may look pretty effortless, but it can burn up 500 calories a day—the equivalent of running about five miles. Where was the help coming from? Was the female completely dependent on her male significant other, as the prevailing theory has always implied? An alternative possibility lay buried in the mystery of menopause. Nature is no friend of the infertile, and in most primates, the end of childbearing coincides with the end of life, so it was always hard to see why human females get to live for years, even decades, after their ovaries go into retirement. Hence the “grandma hypothesis”: maybe the evolutionary “purpose” of the postmenopausal woman was to keep her grandchildren provided with berries and tubers and nuts, especially while Mom was preoccupied with a new baby. If Grandma were still bearing and nursing her own babies, she’d be too busy to baby-sit, so natural selection may have selected for a prolonged healthy and mature, but infertile, stage of the female life cycle.

To test this possibility, anthropologist Kristen Hawkes made quite a nuisance of herself among the hunting-gathering Hadza people of Tanzania, charting the hour-by-hour activities of 90 individuals, male and female, and weighing the children at regular intervals. The results, published in late 1997 and reported by Angier in detail, established that children did better if Grandma was on the case—and, if not her, then a great-aunt or similar grandma figure. This doesn’t prove the grandma hypothesis for all times and all peoples, but it does strongly suggest that in the Stone Age family, Dad-the-hunter was not the only provider. The occasional antelope haunch might be a tasty treat, but as Hawkes and her co-workers conclude about the Hadza, “it is women’s foraging, not men’s hunting, that differentially affects their own families’ nutritional welfare.” If the grandma hypothesis holds up, we may have to conclude that the male-female pair bond was not quite so central to human survival as the evolutionary psychologists assume. The British anthropologist Chris Knight—who is, incidentally, male—suggests that alliances among females may have been more important in shaping the political economy of Paleolithic peoples.

The thinking that led to man-the-hunter was largely inferential: if you bring the women along on the hunt, the children will have to come too, and all that squalling and chattering would surely scare off the game. This inference was based on a particular style of hunting, familiar from Hemingway novels and common to the New England woods in Octo-
ber, in which a small band of men trek off into the wild and patiently stalk their prey, a deer or two at a time. But there is another way to get the job done known as “communal hunting,” in which the entire group—women, men and children—drive the animals over a cliff or into a net or cul-de-sac. The Blackfoot and other Indians hunted bison this way before they acquired the horse—hence all those “buffalo jumps” in the Canadian and American West—and net hunting is the most productive hunting method employed by the Mbuti people of the Congo today. When driving animals into a place where they can be slaughtered, noise is a positive help, whether it’s the clashing of men’s spears or the squeals of massed toddlers.

But there was only indirect evidence of communal hunting in Paleolithic times until archaeologist Olga Soffer came across the kind of clue that, a gender traditionalist might say, it took a womanly eye to notice. While sifting through clay fragments from the Paleolithic site of Pavlov in what is now the Czech Republic, she found a series of parallel lines impressed on some of the clay surfaces—evidence of woven fibers from about 25,000 years ago. Intrigued to find signs of weaving from this early date, Soffer and her colleagues examined 8,400 more clay fragments from the same and nearby sites, eventually coming across the traces of a likely tool of the communal hunt—a mesh net. The entire theory of man-the-hunter had been based on “durable media,” Soffer explains, meaning items like the sharpened stones that can serve as spearheads, rather than softer, biodegradable goods like baskets, fabrics and nets. But in archaeologically well-preserved prehistoric sites, such as those found underwater or in dry caves, the soft goods predominate over the durable by a ratio of about 20 to 1. If the hard stuff was the work of men, then “we’ve been missing the children, the women, the old people,” she asserts. Thanks to Soffer’s sharp eye, Paleolithic net hunting is no longer invisible, and in net hunting, Soffer says, “everybody participates.”

Furthermore, as Mary Zeiss Stange points out in her 1997 book Woman the Hunter, there’s no reason to rule out women’s hunting with hard-edged weapons too, perhaps even of their own making. Among the Tiwi Aborigines of Australia, hunting is considered women’s work, and until the introduction of steel implements, it was done with handmade stone axes the women fashioned for themselves. By putting women’s work back into the record, the new female evolutionary scientists may have helped rewrite the biography of the human race. At least we should prepare to welcome our bold and resourceful new ancestor, Xena the hunter princess.

The news of Soffer’s discovery... will disconcert many feminists as well as sociobiologists. After all, the gratifying thing about man-the-hunter was that he helped locate all the violence and related mischief on the men’s side of the campfire: no blood on our hands! But there are other reasons to doubt the eternal equation of masculinity with aggression and violence, femininity with gentleness and a taste for green salads. In ancient Greece and Sumer the deities of the hunt, Artemis and Ninhursag, were female—extremely female, if you will, since these were also the goddesses who presided over childbirth. Even more striking is the association of ancient goddesses with nature’s original hunters, the predatory animals. In Anatolia, the predator goddess was Kybele, known as the commander of lions. In Egypt she was Sekhmet, portrayed as a lioness whose “mane smoked with fire [and whose] countenance glowed like the sun.”

Images of goddesses tell us nothing about the role of actual women, but they do suggest that about 3,000 years ago, at the dawn of human civilization, the idea of the fearsome huntress, the woman predator, generated no snickers among the pious.

Questions:
1. What are the new theories being suggested?
2. Why are earlier theories being questioned?
3. What kinds of evidence are being used to support the new theories?
Part 1: The Ancient Near East

1.2 An Egyptian Hymn to the Nile

“Hymn to the Nile” is thought to have been composed for a festival in Thebes celebrating the annual flooding of the Nile River. Its date is unknown.


Praise to thee, O Nile, that issueth from the earth, and cometh to nourish Egypt. Of hidden nature, a darkness in the daytime....

That watereth the meadows, he that R-e\(^1\) hath created to nourish all cattle. That giveth drink to the desert places, which are far from water; it is his dew that falleth from heaven.

Beloved of K-eb,\(^2\) director of the corn-god; that maketh to flourish every workshop of Ptah.\(^3\)
Lord of fish, that maketh the water-fowl to go upstream....

That maketh barley and createth wheat, so that he may cause the temples to keep festivals.
If he be sluggish,\(^4\) the nostrils are stopped up,\(^5\) and all men are impoverished; the victuals of the gods are diminished, and millions of men perish.
If he be niggardly the whole land is in terror and great and small lament.... Khnum\(^6\) hath fashioned him. When he riseth, the land is in exultation and every body is in joy. All jaws begin to laugh and every tooth is revealed.

He that bringeth victuals and is rich in food, that createth all that is good. The revered, sweet-smelling.... That createth herbage for the cattle, and giveth sacrifice to every god, be he in the underworld, in heaven, or upon earth.... That filleth the storehouses, and maketh wide the granaries, that giveth things to the poor.

He that maketh trees to grow according to every wish, and men have no lack thereof; the ship is built by his power, for there is no joinery with stones....

... thy young folk and thy children shout for joy over thee, and men hail thee as king. Unchanging of laws, when he cometh forth in the presence of Upper and Lower Egypt. Men drink the water....

He that was in sorrow is become glad, and every heart is joyful. Sobk,\(^7\) the child of Neith, laugheth, and the divine Ennead, that is in thee, is glorious.

Thou that vomitest forth, giving the fields to drink and making strong the people. He that maketh the one rich and loveth the other. He maketh no distinctions, and boundaries are not made for him.

Thou light, that comest forth from the darkness! Thou fat for his cattle. He is a strong one, that createth....

... one beholdeth the wealthy as him that is full of care, one beholdeth each one with his implements.... None that (otherwise) goeth clad, is clad,\(^8\) and the children of notables are unadorned....

He that establisheth right, whom men love.... It would be but lies to compare thee with the sea, that bringeth no corn.... no bird descendeth in the desert....

---

\(^1\) The sun-god.
\(^2\) The earth-god.
\(^3\) Ptah, the craftsman, who fashions everything, could effect nothing without the Nile.
\(^4\) On the occasion of a deficient inundation.
\(^5\) Men no longer breathe and live.
\(^6\) The ram-headed god, who fashions all that is.
\(^7\) Sobk has the form of a crocodile and will originally have been a water-god, who rejoices in the inundation.
\(^8\) For hard work, clothes are taken off.
Men begin to play to thee on the harp, and men sing to thee with the hand. Thy young folk and thy children shout for joy over thee, and deputations to thee are appointed.

He that cometh with splendid things and adorneth the earth! That causeth the ship to prosper before men; that quickeneth the hearts in them that are with child; that would fain have there be a multitude of all kinds of cattle.

When thou art risen in the city of the sovereign, then men are satisfied with a goodly list. “I would like lotus flowers,” saith the little one, “and all manner of things,” saith the commander, “and all manner of herbs,” say the children. Eating bringeth forgetfulness of him. Good things are scattered over the dwelling....

When the Nile floodeth, offering is made to thee, cattle are slaughtered for thee, a great oblation is made for thee. Birds are fattened for thee, antelopes are hunted for thee in the desert. Good is recompensed unto thee.

Offering is also made to every other god, even as is done for the Nile, with incense, oxen, cattle, and birds (upon) the flame. The Nile hath made him his cave in Thebes, and his name shall be known no more in the underworld....

All ye men, extol the Nine Gods, and stand in awe of the might which his son, the Lord of All, hath displayed, even he that maketh green the Two River-banks. Thou art verdant, O Nile, thou art verdant. He that maketh man to live on his cattle, and his cattle on the meadow! Thou art verdant, thou art verdant: O Nile, thou art verdant.

Questions:
1. What values or elements of civilization does this document highlight?
2. Can you link these elements with what you have learned about this civilization?

---

9 It is an old custom to beat time with the hand while singing.
10 I.e., a multitude of good things.
11 The Nile.
1.3 The Epic of Gilgamesh

First written down around 2000 B.C.E., The Epic of Gilgamesh is one of the oldest surviving works of world literature. Based on a real historical figure, King Gilgamesh of Uruk (r. c. 2700 B.C.E.), it tells the story of Gilgamesh’s travels, adventures, and search for immortality. In the process, it provides evidence of ancient ideas about death, humanity, and kingship.


Their first adventure is to secure timber from the distant Cedar Forest, which is guarded by the ogre Humbaba, whom they must kill. Upon their return to Uruk, the fierce Ishtar, goddess of love, tries to entice Gilgamesh into marriage; however, because Gilgamesh and Enkidu spurn Ishtar, she sends down the Bull of Heaven to punish them. Gilgamesh and Enkidu kill this creature, thereby angering the powerful Enlil, king of the gods, who takes his revenge by killing Enkidu. King Gilgamesh is devastated by his friend’s death and laments humanity’s fate.

The second half of the epic is devoted to Gilgamesh’s quest for his secret of life. He descends into the Netherworld in search of Utnapishtim, to whom the gods had granted immortality and from whom he hopes to learn the key to life. When the two meet, Utnapishtim introduces Gilgamesh to the story of the Great Flood, which had killed all life save for Utnapishtim, his family, and the animals he had placed in his great ship. At the end of the Flood tale, Utnapishtim tells Gilgamesh of a certain Plant of Life that can give immortality. Gilgamesh is able to retrieve this plant and bring it back to the living; yet his hopes are dashed when it is eaten by a snake. At the end of the poem, Gilgamesh can only lament the human fate, old age and death.

I will proclaim to the world the deeds of Gilgamesh. This was the man to whom all things were known; this was the king who knew the countries of the world. He was wise, he saw mysteries and knew secret things, he brought us a tale of the days before the flood. He went on a long journey, was weary, wornout with labour, returning he rested, he engraved on a stone the whole story.

When the gods created Gilgamesh they gave him a perfect body. Shamash the glorious sun endowed him with beauty. Adad the god of the storm endowed him with courage, the great gods made his beauty perfect, surpassing all others, terrifying like a great wild bull. Two thirds they made him god and one third man.

In Uruk he built walls, a great rampart, and the temple of blessed Eanna for the god of the firmament Anu, and for Ishtar the goddess of love....

THE COMING OF ENKIDU

Gilgamesh went abroad in the world, but he met with none who could withstand his arms till he came to Uruk. But the men of Uruk muttered in their houses, “Gilgamesh sounds the tocsin for his amusement, his arrogance has no bounds by day or night. No son is left with his father, for Gilgamesh takes them all, even the children; yet the king should be a shepherd to his people. His lust leaves no virgin to her lover, neither the warrior’s daughter nor the wife of the noble; yet this is the shepherd of the city, wise, comely, and resolute.”

The gods heard their lament, the gods of heaven cried to the Lord of Uruk, to Anu the god of Uruk. . . . When Anu had heard their lamentation the gods cried to Aruru, the goddess of creation, “You made him, O Aruru, now create his equal; let it be as like him as his own reflection, his second self, stormy heart for stormy heart. Let them contend together and leave Uruk in quiet.”

So the goddess conceived an image in her mind, and it was of the stuff of Anu of the firmament. She dipped her hands in water and pinched off clay, she let it fall in the wilderness, and noble Enkidu was created. There was a virtue in him of the god of war, of Ninurta himself. His body was rough, he had long hair like a woman’s; it waved like the hair of Nisaba, the goddess of corn. His body was covered with matted hair like Samuqan’s, the god of cattle. He was innocent of mankind; he knew nothing of the cultivated land.

Enkidu ate grass in the hills with the gazelle and lurked with wild beasts at the water-holes; he had joy of the water with the herds of wild game. But there was a trapper who met him one day face to face at the drinking-hole, for the wild game had entered his territory. On three days he met him face to face, and the trapper was frozen with fear. He went back to his house with the game that he had caught, and he was dumb, benumbed with terror. His face was altered like that of one who has made a long journey....

So the trapper set out on his journey to Uruk and addressed himself to Gilgamesh saying, “A man unlike any other is roaming now in the pastures; he is as strong as a star from heaven and I am afraid to approach him. He helps the wild
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game to escape; he fills in my pits and pulls up my traps.” Gilgamesh said, “Trapper, go back, take with you a harlot, a child of pleasure. At the drinking-hole she will strip, and when he sees her beckoning he will embrace her and the game of the wild beasts will be lost.”

Now the trapper returned, taking the harlot with him. After a three days’ journey they came to the drinking-hole, and there they sat down; the harlot and the trapper sat facing one another and waited for the game to come. For the first day and for the second day the two sat waiting, but on the third day the herds came; they came down to drink and Enkidu was with them. The small wild creatures of the plains were glad of the water, and Enkidu with them, who ate grass with the gazelle and was born in the hills; and she saw him, the savage man, come from far-off in the hills. The trapper spoke to her: “There he is. Now, woman, make your breasts bare, have no shame, do not delay but welcome his love. Let him see you naked, let him possess your body. When he comes near uncover yourself and lie with him; teach him, the savage man, your woman’s art, for when he murmurs loves to you the wild beats that shared his life in the hills will reject him.”

She was not ashamed to take him, she made herself naked and welcomed his eagerness; as he lay on her murmuring love she taught him the woman’s art. For six days and seven nights they lay together, for Enkidu had forgotten his home in the hills; but when he was satisfied he went back to the wild beasts. Then, when the gazelle saw him, they bolted away; when the wild creatures saw him they fled. Enkidu would have followed, but his body was bound as though with a cord, his knees gave way when he started to run, his swiftness was gone. And now the wild creatures had all fled away; Enkidu was grown weak, for wisdom was in him, and the thoughts of a man were in his heart. So he returned and sat down at the woman’s feet, and listened intently to what she said, “You are wise, Enkidu, and now you have become like a god. Why do you want to run wild with the beasts in the hills? Come with me. I will take you to strong-walled Uruk, to the blessed temple of Ishtar and of Anu, of love and heaven; there Gilgamesh lives, who is very strong, and like a wild bull he lords it over men.”

And now she said to Enkidu, “When I look at you you have become like a god. Why do you yearn to run wild again with the beasts in the hills? Get up from the ground, the bed of a shepherd.” He listened to her words with care. It was good advice that she gave. She divided her clothing in two and with the other half she clothed him and with the other herself; and holding his had she led him like a child to the sheepfolds, into the shepherds’ tents. There all the shepherds crowded round to see him, they put down bread in front of him, but Enkidu could only suck the milk of wild animals. He fumbled and gaped, at a loss what to do or how he should eat the bread and drink the strong wine. Then the woman said, “Enkidu, eat bread, it is the staff of life; drink the wine, it is the custom of the land.” So he ate till he was full and drank strong wine, seven goblets. He became merry, his heart exulted and his face shone. He rubbed down the matted hair of his body and anointed himself with oil. Enkidu had become a man; but when he had put on man’s clothing he appeared like a bridegroom.

Now Enkidu strode in front and the woman followed behind. He entered Uruk, that great market, and all the folk thronged round him where he stood in the street in strong-walled Uruk. The people jostled; speaking of him they said, “He is the spit of Gilgamesh.” “He is shorter.” “He is bigger of bone.” “This is the one who was reared on the milk of wild beasts. His is the greatest strength.” The men rejoiced: “Now Gilgamesh has met his match. This great one, this hero whose beauty is like a god, he is a match even for Gilgamesh.”

In Uruk the bridal bed was made, fit for the goddess of love. The bride waited for the bridegroom, but in the night Gilgamesh got up and came to the house. Then Enkidu stepped out and stood in the street and blocked the way. Mighty Gilgamesh came on and Enkidu met him at the gate. He put out his foot and prevented Gilgamesh from entering the house, so they grappled, holding each other like bulls. They broke the doorposts and the walls shook. Gilgamesh bent his knee with his foot planted on the ground and with a turn Enkidu was thrown. Then immediately his fury died. When Enkidu was thrown he said to Gilgamesh, “There is not another like you in the world. Ninsun, who is as strong as a wild ox in the byre, she was the mother who bore you, and now you are raised above all men, and Enlil have given you the kingship, for your strength surpasses the strength of men.” So Enkidu and Gilgamesh embraced and their friendship was sealed.

[After they had become good friends, Gilgamesh and Enkidu set out for the Cedar Forest (possible southern Turkey or Phoenicia) in order to secure wood for the city. Before they got to the wood, however, they had to kill a fire-breathing ogre called Humbaba. Succeeding in this mission, they returned to Uruk, where Gilgamesh was offered marriage by the goddess of love, Ishtar (or Inanna).]

Gilgamesh opened his mouth and answered glorious Ishtar, “If I take you in marriage, what gifts can I give in return? What ointments and clothing for your body? I would gladly give you bread and all sorts of food fit for a god. I would give you wine to drink fit for a queen. I would pour out barley to stuff your granary; but as for making you my wife that I will not. How would it go with me? Your lovers have found you like a brazier which smolders in the cold, a back-door which keeps out neither squall of wind nor storm, a castle which crushes the garrison, pitcher that blackens the bearer, a water-skin that chafes the carrier, a stone which falls from the parapet, a battering-ram turned back from the...
enemy, a sandal that trips the wearer. Which of your lovers did you ever love for ever? What shepherd of yours has pleased you for all time?”

[Gravely insulted by the king’s words, Ishtar asked her father, Anu, to punish Gilgamesh by sending the Bull of Heaven to ravage the land. Gilgamesh and Enkidu managed to kill the bull, whose hind leg Enkidu tore off and flung at the goddess. Such a serious offense against the gods demanded immediate punishment; thus did Enkidu fall ill and die.]

So Enkidu lay stretched out before Gilgamesh; his tears ran down in streams and he said to Gilgamesh, “O my brother, so dear as you are to me, brother, yet they will take me from you.” Again he said, “I must sit down on the threshold of the dead and never again will I see my dear brother with my eyes.”

[Gilgamesh was unreconciled to the death of his beloved friend Enkidu. He decided to make a long and difficult journey to the Netherworld in order to search for the secret of immortality. There he encountered the Sumerian Akkadian Noah called Utanapishtim (or Ziusudra). Utanapishtim tells Gilgamesh of a Flood that had been sent by the gods to destroy all life except for Utanapishtim and his family.]

“In those days the world teemed, the people multiplied, the world bellowed like a wild bull, and the great god was aroused by the clamour. Enlil heard the clamour and he said to the gods in council, ‘The uproar of mankind is intolerable and sleep is no longer possible by reason of the babel.’ So the gods agreed to exterminate mankind. Enlil did this, but Ea because of his oath warned me in a dream. He whispered their words to my house of reeds, ‘Reed-house, reed-house! Wall, O wall, hearken reed-house, wall reflect; O man of Shurrupak, son of Ubara-Tuttu; tear down your house and build a boat, abandon possessions and look for life, despise worldly goods and save your soul alive. Tear down your house, I say, and build a boat. These are the measurements of the barque as you shall build her: let her beam equal her length, let her deck be roofed like the vault that covers the abyss; then take up into the boat the seed of all living creatures.’

“In the first light of dawn all my household gathered round me, the children brought pitch and the men whatever was necessary. On the fifth day I laid the keel and the ribs, then I made fast the planking. The ground-space was one acre, each side of the deck measured one hundred and twenty cubits, making a square. I built six decks below, seven in all. I divided them into nine sections with bulkheads between. I drove wedges where needed, I saw to the punt-poles, and laid in supplies. The carriers brought oil in baskets, I poured pitch into the furnace and asphalt and oil; more oil was consumed in caulking, and more again the master of the boat took into his stores. I slaughtered bullocks for the people and every day I killed sheep. I gave the shipwrights wine to drink as though it were river water, raw wine and red wine and oil and white wine. There was feasting then as there is at the time of the New Year’s festival; I myself anointed my head. On the seventh day the boat was complete.

“Then was the launching full of difficulty; there was shifting of ballast above and below till two thirds was submerged. I loaded into her all that I had of gold and of living things, my family, my kin, the beast of the field both wild and tame, and all the craftsmen. I sent them on board, for the time that Shamash had ordained was already fulfilled when he said, ‘In the evening, when the rider of the storm sends down the destroying rain, enter the boat and batten her down.’ The time was fulfilled, the evening came, the rider of the storm sent down the rain. I looked out at the weather and it was terrible, so I too boarded the boat and batten her down. All was now complete, the battenning and the caulking; so I handed the tiller to Puzur-Amurri the steersman, with the navigation and the care of the whole boat.

“For six days and six nights the winds blew, torrent and tempest and flood overwhelmed the world, tempest and flood raged together like warring hosts. When the seventh day dawned the storm from the south subsided, the sea grew calm, the flood was stilled; I looked at the face of the world and there was silence, all mankind was turned to clay. The surface of the sea stretched as flat as a roof-top; I opened a hatch and the light fell on my face. Then I bowed low, I sat down and I wept, the tears streamed down my face, for on every side was the waste of water. I looked for land in vain, but fourteen leagues distant there appeared a mountain, and there the boat grounded; on the mountain of Nisir the boat held fast, she held fast and did not budge. One day she held, and a second day on the mountain of Nisir she held fast and did not budge. A third day, and a fourth day she held fast on the mountain and did not budge; a fifth day and a sixth day she held fast on the mountain. When the seventh day dawned I loosed a dove and let her go. She flew away, but finding no resting-place she returned. Then I loosed a swallow, and she flew away but finding no resting-place she returned. I loosed a raven, she saw that the waters had retreated, she ate, she flew around, she cawed, and she did not come back. Then I threw everything open to the four winds, I made a sacrifice and poured out a libation on the mountain top. Seven and again seven cauldrons I set up on their stands, I heaped up wood and cane and cedar and myrtle. When the gods smelled the sweet savour, they gathered like flies over the sacrifice.”

[Utanapishtim then revealed to Gilgamesh the secret of immortality. With the aid of his ferryman, Urshanabi, King Gilgamesh secured this mysterious prickly plant, but his hopes for future rejuvenation were not to be.]
“Gilgamesh, I shall reveal a secret thing, it is a mystery of the gods that I am telling you. There is a plant that grows under the water, it has a prickle like a thorn, like a rose; it will wound your hands, but if you succeed in taking it, then your hands will hold that which restores his lost youth to a man.”

When Gilgamesh heard this he opened the sluices so that a sweet-water current might carry him out to the deepest channel; he tied heavy stones to his feet and they dragged him down to the water-bed. There he saw the plant growing; although it pricked him he took it in his hands; then he cut the heavy stones from his feet, and the sea carried him and threw him on to the shore. Gilgamesh said to Urshanabi the ferryman, “Come here, and see this marvellous plant. By its virtue a man may win back all his former strength. I will take it to Uruk of the strong walls; there I will give it to the old men to eat. Its name shall be ‘The Old Men Are Young Again’; and at last I shall eat it myself and have back all my lost youth.” So Gilgamesh returned by the gate through which he had come, Gilgamesh and Urshanabi went together. They travelled their twenty leagues and then they broke their fast; after thirty leagues they stopped for the night.

Gilgamesh saw a well of cool water and he went down and bathed; but deep in the pool there was lying a serpent, and the serpent sensed the sweetness of the flower. It rose out of the water and snatched it away, and immediately it sloughed its skin and returned to the well. Then Gilgamesh sat down and wept, the tears ran down his face, and he took the hand of Urshanabi: “O Urshanabi, was it for this that I toiled with my hands, is it for this I have wrung out my heart’s blood? For myself I have gained nothing; not I, but the beast of the earth has joy of it now. Already the stream has carried it twenty leagues back to the channels where I found it. I found a sign and now I have lost it. Let us leave the boat on the bank and go.”

After twenty leagues they broke their fast, after thirty leagues they stopped for the night; in three days they had walked as much as a journey of a month and fifteen days. When the journey was accomplished they arrived at Uruk, the strong-walled city. Gilgamesh spoke to him, to Urshanabi the ferryman, “Urshanabi, climb up on to the wall of Uruk, inspect its foundation terrace, and examine well the brickwork; see if it is not of burnt bricks; and did not the seven wise men lay these foundations? One third of the whole is city, one third is garden, and one third is field, with the precinct of the goddess Ishtar. These parts and the precinct are all Uruk.”

This too was the work of Gilgamesh, the king, who knew the countries of the world. He was wise, he saw mysteries and knew secret things, he brought us a tale of the days before the flood. He went on a long journey, was weary, worn out with labour, and returning engraved on a stone the whole story.

**Questions:**

1. What elements of this epic do you also find in Homer’s Odyssey?
2. Why was Enkidu created and how was he changed?
3. In the second half of the epic, what is Gilgamesh seeking? Does he succeed in this quest?
4. What part of the epic is the most familiar to you?
1.4 Hittite Laws

The Hittites emerged as a major power around 1520 B.C.E when King Telipinus seized the throne and unified his people. In time, Hittite power grew to rival that of Egypt. The Hittite laws included here express the society’s values, structure, and priorities.


1. If anyone kills a man or a woman in a quarrel, he shall be declared liable for him/her. He shall give four persons, man or woman, and pledge his estate as security.
2. If anyone kills a male or female slave in a quarrel, he shall be declared liable for him/her. He shall give two persons, man or woman, and pledge his estate as security.
3. If anyone strikes a free man or woman and he/she dies, (only) his hand doing wrong, he shall be declared liable for him/her. He shall give two persons and pledge his estate as security.
4. If anyone strikes a male or a female slave and he/she dies, (only) his hand doing wrong, he shall be liable for him/her. He shall give one person and pledge his estate as security.
5. If anyone blinds a free man or knocks out his teeth, they would formerly give one mina of silver; now he shall give twenty shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security.
6. If anyone blinds a male or female slave or knocks out his/her teeth, he shall give ten shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security.
7. If anyone batters a man’s head, they would formerly give six shekels of silver; he who was battered would receive three shekels of silver, and they would receive three shekels of silver for the palace. Now the king has abolished the (share) of the palace and only he who was battered received three shekels of silver.
8. If anyone batters a man so that he falls ill, he shall take care of him. He shall give a man in his stead who can look after his house until he recovers. When he recovers, he shall give him six shekels of silver, and he shall also pay the physician’s fee. Later version of 10: If anyone injures a free man’s head, he shall take care of him. He shall give a man in his stead who can look after his house until he recovers. When he recovers, he shall give him ten shekels of silver, and he shall also pay the physician’s fee. If it is a slave, he shall pay two shekels of silver.
9. If anyone breaks a free man’s hand or foot, he shall give him twenty shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security.
10. If anyone breaks the hand or foot of a male or a female slave, he shall give ten shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security. Later version of 11 and 12: If anyone breaks a free man’s hand or foot, in case he is permanently crippled, he shall give him shekels of silver. If anyone breaks a slave’s hand or foot, in case he is permanently crippled, he shall give him ten shekels of silver. But in case he is not permanently crippled, he shall give him five shekels of silver.
11. If anyone breaks a free man’s hand or foot, he shall give him twenty shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security.
12. If anyone breaks the hand or foot of a male or a female slave, he shall give ten shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security. Later version of 11 and 12: If anyone breaks a free man’s hand or foot, in case he is permanently crippled, he shall give him shekels of silver. If anyone breaks a slave’s hand or foot, in case he is permanently crippled, he shall give him ten shekels of silver. But in case he is not permanently crippled, he shall give him five shekels of silver.
13. If anyone bites off a free man’s nose, he shall give thirty shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security.
14. If anyone bites off the nose of a male or female slave, he shall give thirty shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security.
15. If anyone causes a free woman to miscarry—if (it is the ninth or) the tenth month, he shall give ten shekels of silver, if (it is) fifth month, he shall give five shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security.
16. If anyone causes a slave woman to miscarry, if (it is) the tenth month, he shall give five shekels of silver.
17. If anyone causes a slave woman to miscarry, if (it is) the tenth month, he shall give ten shekels of silver and pledge his estate as security.
18. If anyone causes a slave woman to miscarry, if (it is) the tenth month, he shall give five shekels of silver.
19. If a slave runs away and anyone brings him back—if he seizes him in the vicinity, he shall give him shoes; if on this side of the river, he shall give him two shekels of silver; if on the other side of the river, he shall give him three shekels of silver.
20. If a slave runs away and goes to the country of Luwiya, he shall give to him who brings him back six shekels of silver.
21. If a slave runs away and goes to an enemy country, whoever brings him nevertheless back, shall receive him (the slave) himself.
22. If a male or female slave runs away, the man at whose hearth his master finds him/her, shall give a man’s wages for one year, (namely) x shekels of silver, or a woman’s wages for one year, namely x shekels of silver.
23. If a slave runs away and goes to the country of Luwiya, he shall give to him who brings him back six shekels of silver. If a slave runs away and goes to an enemy country, whoever brings him nevertheless back, shall receive him (the slave) himself.
24. If a male or female slave runs away, the man at whose hearth his master finds him/her, shall give a man’s wages for one year, (namely) x shekels of silver, or a woman’s wages for one year, namely x shekels of silver.
25. If a man takes a wife and carries her to his house, he takes her dowry with her. If the woman dies, they turn her property into (property) of the man, and the man also receives her dowry. But if she dies in the house of her father, and there are children, the man will not receive her dowry.
29. If a girl is betrothed to a man and he has given the bride-price for her, but the parents subsequently abrogate the contract and withhold her from the man, they shall make double compensation.

32. If a slave takes a free woman, the provision of the law is the same for them.

33. If a slave takes a slave-girl, the provision of the law is the same for them.

57. If anyone steals a bull—if it is a weanling, it is not a bull; if it is a yearling, it is not a bull; if it is a two-year-old, that is a bull—they would formerly give thirty (head of) cattle. Now he shall give fifteen (head of) cattle, (specifically) five two-year-olds, five yearlings (and) five weanlings and he shall pledge his estate as security.

60. If anyone finds a bull and removes the brand, (if) its owner traces it out, he shall give seven (head of) cattle; he shall give (specifically) two two-year-olds, three yearlings, and two weanlings and he shall pledge his estate as security.

61. If anyone finds a stallion and removes the brand, (if) its owner traces it out, he shall give seven horses; he shall give (specifically) two two-year-olds, three yearlings, and two weanlings and he shall pledge his estate as security.

94. If a free man steals a house, he shall give (back) the respective goods; they would formerly give for the theft one mina of silver, but now he shall give twelve shekels of silver. If he has stolen much, they shall impose a heavy fine upon him; if he has stolen little, they shall impose a small fine upon him and pledge his estate as security.

98. If a free man sets a house on fire, he shall rebuild the house. Whatever was lost in the house, whether it is man, cattle or sheep, he shall replace as a matter of course.

99. If a slave sets a house on fire, his master shall make compensation in his stead. They shall cut off the slave’s nose (and) ears and shall give him back to his master. But if he does not make compensation, he will lose that (slave).

172. If a man saves a free man’s life in a year of famine, he shall give (a person) like himself. If he is a slave, he shall give ten shekels of silver.

173. If anyone rejects the judgment of the king, his house shall be made a shambles. If anyone rejects the judgment of a dignitary, they shall cut off his head. If a slave rises against his master, he shall go into the pit.

188. If a man does evil with a sheep, it is a capital crime and he shall be killed. They bring him to the king’s court. Whether the king orders him killed or whether the king spares his life, he must not appeal to the king.

189. If a man violates his own mother, it is a capital crime. If a man violates his daughter, it is a capital crime. If a man violates his son, it is a capital crime.

192. If a man’s wife dies (and) he marries his wife’s sister, the shall be no punishment.

193. If a man has a wife and then the man dies, his brother shall take his wife, then his father shall take her. If in turn also his father dies, one of the brother’s sons shall take the wife whom he had. There shall be no punishment.

197. If a man seizes a woman in the mountains, it is the man’s crime and he will be killed. But if he seizes her in (her) house, it is the woman’s crime and the woman shall be killed. If the husband finds them, he may kill them: there shall be no punishment for him.

198. If he brings them to the gate of the palace and declares: “My wife shall not be killed” and thereby spares his wife’s life, he shall also spare the life of the adulterer and shall mark his head. If he says, “Let them die, both of them!” . . . The king may order them killed, the king may spare their lives.

199. If anyone does evil with a pig, (or) a dog, he shall die. They will bring him to the gate of the palace and the king may order them killed, the king may spare their lives; but he must not appeal to the king. If an ox leaps at a man, the ox shall die, but the man shall not die. A sheep may be proffered in the man’s stead and they shall kill that. If a pig leaps at a man, there shall be no punishment.

Questions:
1. Was there legal equality among the Hittites?
2. Why would we say that the Hittite code closely approximates that of the Visigoths?
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1.5 Hammurabi’s Law Code

In the twenty-second year of his reign, the Amorite King Hammurabi (d. 1750 B.C.E.), who had made Babylon his capital and conquered Mesopotamia, issued a comprehensive code of laws. He caused them to be inscribed on stones that were erected at crossroads and in marketplaces throughout his kingdom so that all his subjects would know them. A selection of these laws follows.

Source: gopher://gopher.vt.edu: 10010/11/, translated by Leonard W. King
[Accessed through http:// eawc.evansville.edu/anthology/hammurabi.htm]

When Anu the Sublime, King of the Anunaki, and Bel, the lord of Heaven and earth, who decreed the fate of the land, assigned to Marduk, the over-ruling son of Ea, God of righteousness, dominion over earthly man, and made him great...; then Anu and Bel called by name me, Hammurabi, the exalted prince, who feared God, to bring about the rule of righteousness in the land, to destroy the wicked and the evil-doers; so that the strong should not harm the weak; so that I should rule over the black-headed people like Shamash, and enlighten the land, to further the well-being of mankind....

When Marduk sent me to rule over men, to give the protection of right to the land, I did right and righteousness in..., and brought about the well-being of the oppressed.

THE CODE OF LAWS
[to ensure good justice]

3. If any one bring an accusation of any crime before the elders, and does not prove what he has charged, he shall, if it be a capital offense charged, be put to death.

5. If a judge try a case, reach a decision, and present his judgment in writing; if later error shall appear in his decision, and it be through his own fault, then he shall pay twelve times the fine set by him in the case, and he shall be publicly removed from the judge’s bench, and never again shall he sit there to render judgement.

[criminal law of property]

8. If any one steal cattle or sheep, or an ass, or a pig or a goat, if it belong to a god or to the court, the thief shall pay thirtyfold therefore; if they belonged to a freed man of the king he shall pay tenfold; if the thief has nothing with which to pay he shall be put to death.

21. If any one break a hole into a house (break in to steal), he shall be put to death before that hole and be buried.

22. If any one is committing a robbery and is caught, then he shall be put to death.

23. If the robber is not caught, then shall he who was robbed claim under oath the amount of his loss; then shall the community, and... on whose ground and territory and in whose domain it was compensate him for the goods stolen.

[property laws concerning agriculture and irrigation]

42. If any one take over a field to till it, and obtain no harvest therefrom, it must be proved that he did no work on the field, and he must deliver grain, just as his neighbor raised, to the owner of the field.

45. If a man rent his field for tillage for a fixed rental, and receive the rent of his field, but bad weather come and destroy the harvest, the injury falls upon the tiller of the soil.

46. If he do not receive a fixed rental for his field, but lets it on half or third shares of the harvest, the grain on the field shall be divided proportionately between the tiller and the owner.

48. If any one owe a debt for a loan, and a storm prostrates the grain, or the harvest fail, or the grain does not grow for lack of water; in that year he need not give his creditor any grain, he washes his debt-tablet in water and pays no rent for this year.

53. If any one be too lazy to keep his dam in proper condition, and does not so keep it; if then the dam break and all the fields be flooded, then shall he in whose dam the break occurred be sold for money, and the money shall replace the corn which he has caused to be ruined.

55. If any one open his ditches to water his crop, but is careless, and the water flood the field of his neighbor, then he shall pay his neighbor corn for his loss.
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[laws governing debts and obligations]

108. If a tavern-keeper (feminine form) does not accept corn according to gross weight in payment of drink, but takes money, and the price of the drink is less than that of the corn, she shall be convicted and thrown into the water.

117. If any one fail to meet a claim for debt, and sell himself, his wife, his son, and daughter for money or give them away to forced labor: they shall work for three years in the house of the man who bought them, or the proprietor, and in the fourth year they shall be set free.

121. If any one store corn in another man’s house he shall pay him storage at the rate of one gur1 for every five ka2 of corn per year.

122. If any one give another silver, gold, or anything else to keep, he shall show everything to some witness, draw up a contract, and then hand it over for safe keeping.

123. If he turn it over for safe keeping without witness or contract, and if he to whom it was given deny it, then he has no legitimate claim.

[laws concerning marriage, family, and inheritance]

128. If a man take a woman to wife, but have no intercourse with her, this woman is no wife to him.

129. If a man’s wife be surprised [in a sexually compromising situation] with another man, both shall be tied and thrown into the water, but the husband may pardon his wife and the king his [subjects].

130. If a man violate the wife (betrothed or child-wife) of another man, who has never known a man, and still lives in her father’s house, and sleep with her and be surprised, this man shall be put to death, but the wife is blameless.

131. If a man bring a charge against one’s wife, but she is not surprised with another man, she must take an oath and then may return to her house.

133. If a man is taken prisoner in war, and there is a sustenance in his house, but his wife leave house and court, and go to another house: because this wife did not keep her court, and went to another house, she shall be judicially condemned and thrown into the water.

134. If any one be captured in war and there is not sustenance in his house, if then his wife go to another house this woman shall be held blameless.

136. If any one leave his house, run away, and then his wife go to another house, if then he return, and wishes to take his wife back: because he fled from his home and ran away, the wife of this runaway shall not return to her husband.

137. If a man wish to separate from a woman who has borne him children, or from his wife who has borne him children: then he shall give that wife her dowry, and a part of the usufruct of field, garden, and property, so that she can rear her children. When she has brought up her children, a portion of all that is given to the children, equal as that of one son, shall be given to her. She may then marry the man of her heart.

138. If a man wishes to separate from his wife who has borne him no children, he shall give her the amount of her purchase money and the dowry which she brought from her father’s house, and let her go.

142. If a woman quarrel with her husband, and say: “You are not congenial to me,” the reasons for her prejudice must be presented. If she is guiltless, and there is no fault on her part, but he leaves and neglects her, then no guilt attaches to this woman, she shall take her dowry and go back to her father’s house.

143. If she is not innocent, but leaves her husband, and ruins her house, neglecting her husband, this woman shall be cast into the water.

144. If a man take a wife, and she be seized by disease, if he then desire to take a second wife he shall not put away his wife, who has been attacked by disease, but he shall keep her in the house which he has built and support her so long as she lives.

149. If this woman does not wish to remain in her husband’s house, then he shall compensate her for the dowry that she brought with her from her father’s house, and she may go.

154. If a man be guilty of incest with his daughter, he shall be driven from the place (exiled).

157. If any one be guilty of incest with his mother after his father, both shall be burned.

158. If any one be surprised after his father with his chief wife, who has borne children, he shall be driven out of his father’s house.

159. If any one, who has brought chattels into his father-in-law’s house, and has paid the purchase-money, looks for another wife, and says to his father-in-law: “I do not want your daughter,” the girl’s father may keep all that he had brought.
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160. If a man bring chattels into the house of his father-in-law, and pay the “purchase price” (for his wife): if then the father of the girl say: “I will not give you my daughter,” he shall give him back all that he brought with him.

163. If a man marry a woman and she bear him no sons; if then this woman die, if the “purchase price” which he had paid into the house of his father-in-law is repaid to him, her husband shall have no claim upon the dowry of this woman; it belongs to her father’s house.

168. If a man wish to put his son out of his house, and declare before the judge: “I want to put my son out,” then the judge shall examine into his reasons. If the son be guilty of no great fault, for which he can be rightfully put out, the father shall not put him out.

170. If his wife bear sons to a man, or his maid-servant have borne sons, and the father while still living says to the children whom his maid-servant has borne: “My sons,” and he count them with the sons of his wife; if then the father die, then the sons of the wife and of the maid-servant shall divide the paternal property in common. The son of the wife is to partition and choose.

180. If a father give a present to his daughter—either marriageable or a prostitute (unmarriageable)—and then die, then she is to receive a portion as a child from the paternal estate, and enjoy its usufruct so long as she lives. Her estate belongs to her brothers.

184. If a man do not give a dowry to his daughter by a concubine, and no husband; if then her father die, her brother shall give her a dowry according to her father’s wealth and secure a husband for her.

185. If a man adopt a child and to his name as son, and rear him, this grown son can not be demanded back again.

190. If a man does not maintain a child that he has adopted as a son and reared with his other children, then his adopted son may return to his father’s house.

[laws concerning physical harm to persons or animals]

195. If a son strike his father, his hands shall be hewn off.

196. If a man put out the eye of another man, his eye shall be put out.

197. If he break another man’s bone, his bone shall be broken.

198. If he put out the eye of a freed man, or break the bone of a freed man, he shall pay one gold mina.

199. If he put out the eye of a man’s slave, or break the bone of a man’s slave, he shall pay one-half of its value.

200. If a man knock out the teeth of his equal, his teeth shall be knocked out.

201. If he knock out the teeth of a freed man, he shall pay one-third of a gold mina.

202. If any one strike the body of a man higher in rank than he, he shall receive sixty blows with an ox-whip in public.

203. If a free-born man strike the body of another free-born man or equal rank, he shall pay one gold mina.

204. If a freed man strike the body of another freed man, he shall pay ten shekels in money.

205. If the slave of a freed man strike the body of a freed man, his ear shall be cut off.

206. If during a quarrel one man strike another and wound him, then he shall swear, “I did not injure him unwittingly,” and pay the physicians.

207. If the man die of his wound, he shall swear similarly, and if he (the deceased) was a free-born man, he shall pay half a mina in money.

208. If he was a freed man, he shall pay one-third of a mina.

209. If a man strike a free-born woman so that she lose her unborn child, he shall pay ten shekels for her loss.

210. If the woman die, her daughter shall be put to death.

211. If a woman of the free class lose her child by a blow, he shall pay five shekels....

212. If this woman die, he shall pay half a mina.

213. If he strike the maidservant of a man, and she lose her child, he shall pay two shekels....

214. If this maid-servant die, he shall pay one-third of a mina.

[liability laws and fair prices]

219. If a physician make a large incision in the slave of a freed man, and kill him, he shall replace the slave with another slave.

221. If a physician heal the broken bone or diseased soft part of a man, the patient shall pay the physician five shekels in money.

222. If he were a freed man he shall pay three shekels.
223. If he were a slave his owner shall pay the physician two shekels.
224. If a veterinary surgeon perform a serious operation on an ass or an ox, and cure it, the owner shall pay the surgeon one-sixth of a shekel as a fee.
225. If he perform a serious operation on an ass or ox, and kill it, he shall pay the owner one-fourth of its value.
228. If a builder build a house for some one and complete it, he shall give him a fee of two shekels in money for each sar of surface.
229. If a builder build a house for some one, and does not construct it properly, and the house which he built fall in and kill its owner, then that builder shall be put to death.
230. If it kill the son of the owner the son of that builder shall be put to death.
231. If it kill a slave of the owner, then he shall pay slave for slave to the owner of the house.
232. If it ruin goods, he shall make compensation for all that has been ruined, and inasmuch as he did not construct properly this house which he built and it fell, he shall re-erect the house from his own means.
234. If a shipbuilder build a boat of sixty gur for a man, he shall pay him a fee of two shekels in money.
235. If a shipbuilder build a boat for some one, and do not make it tight, if during that same year that boat is sent away and suffers injury, the shipbuilder shall take the boat apart and put it together tight at his own expense. The tight boat he shall give to the boat owner.
239. If a man hire a sailor, he shall pay him six gur of corn per year.
240. If any one hire an ox or an ass, and a lion kill it in the field, the loss is upon its owner.
245. If any one hire oxen, and kill them by bad treatment or blows, he shall compensate the owner, oxen for oxen.
247. If any one hire an ox, and put out its eye, he shall pay the owner one-half of its value.
249. If any one hire an ox, and God strike it that it die, the man who hired it shall swear by God and be considered guiltless.
251. If an ox be a goring ox, and it shown that he is a gorer, and he do not bind his horns, or fasten the ox up, and the ox gore a free-born man and kill him, the owner shall pay one-half a mina in money.
257. If any one hire a field laborer, he shall pay him eight gur of corn per year.
258. If any one hire an ox-driver, he shall pay him six gur of corn per year.
261. If any one hire a herdsman for cattle or sheep, he shall pay him eight gur of corn per [year].
263. If he kill the cattle or sheep that were given to him, he shall compensate the owner with cattle for cattle and sheep for sheep.
267. If the herdsman overlook something, and an accident happen in the stable, then the herdsman is at fault for the accident which he has caused in the stable, and he must compensate the owner for the cattle or sheep.
282. If a slave say to his master: “You are not my master,” if they convict him his master shall cut off his ear.

THE EPILOGUE

Laws of justice which Hammurabi, the wise king, established. A righteous law, and pious statute did he teach the land. Hammurabi, the protecting king am I. I have not withdrawn myself from the men, whom Bel gave to me, the rule over whom Marduk gave to me, I was not negligent, but I made them a peaceful abiding-place.... That the strong might not injure the weak, in order to protect the widows and orphans, I have in Babylon the city where Anu and Bel raise high their head, in E-Sagil, the Temple, whose foundations stand firm as heaven and earth, in order to bespeak justice in the land, to settle all disputes, and heal all injuries, set up these my precious words, written upon my memorial stone, before the image of me, as king of righteousness.

The king who ruleth among the kings of the cities am I. My words are well considered; there is no wisdom like unto mine. By the command of Shamash, the great judge of heaven and earth, let righteousness go forth in the land: by the order of Marduk, my lord, let no destruction befall my monument. In E-Sagil, which I love, let my name be ever repeated; let the oppressed, who has a case at law, come and stand before this my image as king of righteousness; let him read the inscription, and understand my precious words: the inscription will explain his case to him; he will find out what is just, and his heart will be glad, so that he will say:

“Hammurabi is a ruler, who is as a father to his subjects, who holds the words of Marduk in reverence, who has achieved conquest for Marduk over the north and south, who rejoices the heart of Marduk, his lord, who has bestowed benefits for ever and ever on his subjects, and has established order in the land.”

... If a succeeding ruler considers my words, which I have written in this my inscription, if he do not annul my law, nor corrupt my words, nor change my monument, then may Shamash lengthen that king’s reign, as he has that of me, the king of righteousness, that he may reign in righteousness over his subjects.
If this ruler do not esteem my words, which I have written in my inscription, if he despise my curses, and fear not the curse of God, if he destroy the law which I have given, corrupt my words, change my monument, efface my name, write his name there, or on account of the curses commission another so to do, that man… may the great God (Anu), the Father of the gods, who has ordered my rule, withdraw from him the glory of royalty, break his scepter, curse his destiny. May Bel, the lord, who fixeth destiny, … order with his potent mouth the destruction of his city, the dispersion of his subjects, the cutting off of his rule, the removal of his name and memory from the land. … May Bel curse him with the potent curses of his mouth that can not be altered, and may they come upon him forthwith.

Questions:
1. What are the authority and principles on which this law code is based?
2. How are the law codes similar to the “Laws of the Hebrews” in document 1.6?
3. What do these two law codes reveal about the social structure, family, and the position of women in each society?
1.6 Laws of the Hebrews

The basis of Hebrew law is the code of moral law known as the Ten Commandments that, according to the account in Genesis, their God Yahweh gave them on Mt. Sinai in the thirteenth century B.C.E. The Hebrews also had other laws and customs they followed that applied those broad principles more specifically.


EXODUS 20: 1-17

The Ten Commandments

1. And God spoke all these words:
2. “I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery.
3. “You shall have no other gods before [besides] me.
4-6. “You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below. You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I, the LORD your God, am a jealous God, punishing the children for the sin of the fathers to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing love to a thousand [generations] of those who love me and keep my commandments.
7. “You shall not misuse the name of the LORD your God, for the LORD will not hold anyone guiltless who misuses his name.
8-11. “Remember the Sabbath day by keeping it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath to the LORD your God. On it you shall not do any work, neither you, nor your son or daughter, nor your manservant or maidservant, nor your animals, nor the alien within your gates. For in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but he rested on the seventh day. Therefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy.
12. “Honor your father and your mother, so that you may live long in the land the LORD your God is giving you.
15. “You shall not steal.
16. “You shall not give false testimony against your neighbor.
17. “You shall not covet your neighbor’s house. You shall not covet your neighbor’s wife, or his manservant or maidservant, his ox or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbor.”

EXODUS 21

Regarding Slaves and Servants

1. “These are the laws you are to set before them:
2. “If you buy a Hebrew servant, he is to serve you for six years. But in the seventh year, he shall go free, without paying anything.
3. “If he comes alone, he is to go free alone; but if he has a wife when he comes, she is to go with him.
4. “If his master gives him a wife and she bears him sons or daughters, the woman and her children shall belong to her master, and only the man shall go free.
5-6. “But if the servant declares, ‘I love my master and my wife and children and do not want to go free,’ then his master must take him before the judges. He shall take him to the door or the doorpost and pierce his ear with an awl. Then he will be his servant for life.
7. “If a man sells his daughter as a servant, she is not to go free as menservants do.

Regarding Crimes of Violence

12. “Anyone who strikes a man and kills him shall surely be put to death.
13. “However, if he does not do it intentionally, but God lets it happen, he is to flee to a place I will designate.
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17. “Anyone who curses his father or mother must be put to death.
18-19. “If men quarrel and one hits the other with a stone or with his fist [or tool] and he does not die but is confined to bed, the one who struck the blow will not be held responsible if the other gets up and walks around outside with his staff however, he must pay the injured man for the loss of his time and see that he is completely healed.
20-21. “If a man beats his male or female slave with a rod and the slave dies as a direct result, he must be punished, but he is not to be punished if the slave gets up after a day or two, since the slave is his property.
22. “If men who are fighting hit a pregnant woman and she gives birth prematurely [or she has a miscarriage] but there is no serious injury, the offender must be fined whatever the woman’s husband demands and the court allows.
23-25. “But if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, wound for wound, bruise for bruise.
26. “If a man hits a manservant or maidservant in the eye and destroys it, he must let the servant go free to compensate for the eye.
27. “And if he knocks out the tooth of a manservant or maidservant, he must let the servant go free to compensate for the tooth.

Regarding Liability Regarding Property

28. “If a bull gores a man or a woman to death, the bull must be stoned to death, and its meat must not be eaten. But the owner of the bull will not be held responsible.
29. “If, however, the bull has had the habit of goring and the owner has been warned but has not kept it penned up and it kills a man or woman, the bull must be stoned and the owner also must be put to death.
30. “However, if payment is demanded of him, he may redeem his life by paying whatever is demanded.
31. “This law also applies if the bull gored a son or daughter.
32. “If the bull gored a male or female slave, the owner must pay thirty shekels [about 12 ounces] of silver to the master of the slave, and the bull must be stoned.
33-34. “If a man uncovers a pit or digs one and fails to cover it and an ox or a donkey falls into it, the owner of the pit must pay for the loss; he must pay its owner, and the dead animal will be his.
35. “If a man’s bull injures the bull of another and it dies, they are to sell the live one and divide both the money and the dead animal equally.
36. “However, if it was known that the bull had the habit of goring, yet the owner did not keep it penned up, the owner must pay, animal for animal, and the dead animal will be his.

EXODUS 22

1. “If a man steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters it or sells it, he must pay back five head of cattle for the ox and four sheep for the sheep.
2-3. “If a thief is caught breaking in and is struck so that he dies, the defender is not guilty of bloodshed; but if it happens after sunrise, he is guilty of bloodshed. A thief must certainly make restitution, but if he has nothing, he must be sold to pay for his theft.
5. “If a man grazes his livestock in a field or vineyard and lets them stray and they graze in another man’s field, he must make restitution from the best of his own field or vineyard.
6. “If a fire breaks out and spreads into thombsuses so that it burns shocks of grain or standing grain or the whole field, the one who started the fire must make restitution.
14. “If a man borrows an animal from his neighbor and it is injured or dies while the owner is not present, he must make restitution.
15. “But if the owner is with the animal, the borrower will not have to pay. If the animal was hired, the money paid for the hire covers the loss.

Regarding Relationships and Ethical Behavior

16. “If a man seduces a virgin who is not pledged to be married and sleeps with her, he must pay the bride-price, and she shall be his wife.
17. “If her father absolutely refuses to give her to him, he must still pay the bride-price for virgins.
18. “Do not allow a sorceress to live.
19. “Anyone who has sexual relations with an animal must be put to death.
20. “Whoever sacrifices to any god other than the LORD must be destroyed.
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21. “Do not mistreat an alien or oppress him, for you were aliens in Egypt.
22. “Do not take advantage of a widow or an orphan.
23. “If you do and they cry out to me, I will certainly hear their cry.
24. “My anger will be aroused, and I will kill you with the sword; your wives will become widows and your children fatherless.
25. “If you lend money to one of my people among you who is needy, do not be like a moneylender; charge him no interest.
26-27. “If you take your neighbor’s cloak as a pledge, return it to him by sunset, because his cloak is the only covering he has for his body. What else will he sleep in? When he cries out to me, I will hear, for I am compassionate.
31. “You are to be my holy people....

EXODUS 23

1. “Do not spread false reports. Do not help a wicked man by being a malicious witness.
2-3. “Do not follow the crowd in doing wrong. When you give testimony in a lawsuit, do not pervert justice by siding with the crowd, and do not show favoritism to a poor man in his lawsuit.
4. “If you come across your enemy’s ox or donkey wandering off, be sure to take it back to him.
5. “If you see the donkey of someone who hates you fallen down under its load, do not leave it there; be sure you help him with it.
6. “Do not deny justice to your poor people in their lawsuits.
7. “Have nothing to do with a false charge and do not put an innocent or honest person to death, for I will not acquit the guilty.
8. “Do not accept a bribe, for a bribe blinds those who see and twists the words of the righteous.
9. “Do not oppress an alien; you yourselves know how it feels to be aliens, because you were aliens in Egypt.
10. “For six years you are to sow your fields and harvest the crops,
11. “But during the seventh year let the land lie unplowed and unused. Then the poor among your people may get food from it, and the wild animals may eat what they leave. Do the same with your vineyard and your olive grove.

Questions:
1. What are the authority and principles on which this law code is based?
2. How are the law codes similar to Hammurabi’s Law Code in document 1.5? How are they different?
3. What do these two law codes reveal about the social structure, family, and the position of women in each society?
1.7 The Instruction of the Ptah-hotep

No Law codes survive from the Egyptian Old Kingdom (2700-2200 B.C.E.). Worldly wisdom and clues to its culture's basic principles and ethics emerge from the texts inscribed in the tombs of the kings and of nobles such as Ptah-hotep, a vizier (chief minister) who lived around 2450 B.C.E. He addressed these instructions to his son, setting forth rules of appropriate behavior. The term “maat” in this text carries with it the meaning of accepted tradition and truth that has always worked and produced harmony.


The mayor and vizier Ptah-hotep said: “O king, my lord, years come on, old age is here, decrepitude arrives, weakness is renewed.... Let it be commanded of your servant to make a staff of old age: let my son be set in my place. Let me tell him the sayings of those who obeyed, the conduct of them of old, of them who listened to the gods....

Said the majesty of this god [the king]: “Instruct him in the sayings of the past.... Speak to him, for no one is born wise.”

TITLE AND AIM

Beginning of the maxims of good words spoken by the... mayor and vizier, Ptah-hotep, teaching the ignorant to know according to the standard of good words, expounding the profit to him who shall listen to it, and the injury to him who shall transgress it. He said to his son:

INTELLECTUAL SNOBBERY

Be not arrogant because of your knowledge, and be not puffed up because you are a learned man. Take counsel with the ignorant as with the learned, for the limits of art cannot be reached, and no artist is perfect in his skills. Good speech is more hidden than the precious greenstone, and yet it is found among slave girls at the millstones....

LEADERSHIP AND “MAAT”

If you are a leader, commanding the conduct of many, seek out every good aim, so that your policy may be without error. A great thing is truth [maat], enduring and surviving; it has not been upset since the time of Osiris. He who departs from its laws is punished. It is the right path for him who knows nothing. Wrongdoing has never brought its venture safe to port. Evil may win riches, but it is the strength of truth that it endures long, and a man can say, “I learned it from my father.”...

CONDUCT AS A GUEST AT TABLE

If you are a guest at the table of one who is greater than you, take what he offers as it is set before you. Fix your gaze upon what is before you, and pierce not your host with many glances, for it is an abomination to force your attention upon him. Speak not to him until he calls, for no one knows what may be offensive; speak when he addresses you, for then your words will give satisfaction. Laugh when he laughs; that will please him, and then whatever you do will please him....

PATIENCE WITH SUPPLIANTS

If you are a leader be kind in hearing the speech of a suppliant. Treat him not roughly until he has unburdened himself of what he was minded to tell you. The compliant sets greater store by the easing of his mind than by the accomplishment of that for which he came. As for him who deals roughly with a petition, men say, “Why, pray, has he ignored it?” Not all that men plead for ever comes to pass, but to listen kindly soothes the heart.

RELATIONS WITH WOMEN

If you wish to prolong friendship in a house into which you enter as master, brother or friend, or any place that you enter, beware of approaching the women. No place in which that is done prospers. There is no wisdom in it. A thousand men are turned aside from their own good because of a little moment, like a dream, by tasting which death is reached.... He who... lusting after women, no plan of his will succeed.
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GREED
If you want your conduct to be good, free from every evil, then beware of greed. It is an evil and incurable sickness. No man can live with it; it causes divisions between fathers and mothers, and between brothers of the same mother; it parts wife and husband; it is a gathering of every evil, a bag of everything hateful. A man thrives if his conduct is right. He who follows the right course wins wealth thereby. But the greedy man has no tomb....

MARRIAGE
If you are prosperous you should establish a household and love your wife as is fitting. Fill her belly and clothe her back. Oil is the tonic for her body. Make her heart glad as long as you live. She is a profitable field for her lord....

CONDUCT IN COUNCIL
If you are a worthy man sitting in the council of his lord, confine your attention to excellence. Silence is more valuable than chatter. Speak only when you know you can resolve difficulties. He who gives good counsel is an artist, for speech is more difficult than any craft....

Behavior in Changed Circumstances
If you are now great after being humble and rich after being poor in the city that you know, do not boast because of what happened to you in the past. Be not miserly with your wealth, which has come to you by the god’s [the king’s] gift. You are no different from another to whom the same has happened.

OBEDIENCE TO A SUPERIOR
Bend your back to him who is over you, your superior in the administration; then your house will endure by reason of its property, and your reward will come in due season. Wretched is he who opposes his superior, for one lives only so long as he is gracious....

EXHORTATION TO LISTEN
If you listen to my sayings, then all your affairs will go forward. They are precious; their memory goes on in the speech of men because of their excellence. If each saying is carried on, they will never perish in this land....

If the son of a man accepts what his father says, no plan of his will fail.... Failure follows him who does not listen. He who hears is established; he who is a fool is crushed....

A son who hears is a follower of Horus: there is good for him who listens. When he reaches old age and attains honor, he tells the like to his children, renewing the teaching of his father. Every man teaches as he has acted. He speaks to his children so that they may speak to their children....

CONCLUSION
May you succeed me, may your body be sound, may the king be well pleased with all that is done, and may you spend many years of life! It is no small thing that I have done on earth; I have spent one hundred and ten years of life, which the king gave me, and with rewards greater than those of the ancestors, by doing right for the king until death.

Questions:
1. What are the guiding principles of behavior revealed in these instructions?
2. Keeping in mind that these are a parent’s advice rather than enforced law, how do they differ from the ethical principles set forth in Hammurabi’s and the Hebrew’s laws above?
3. What does this document reveal about Egyptian society during this period?
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2.1 Laws Relating to Women: Excerpts from the Gortyn Law Code

These laws that date from the fifth century B.C.E. provide the women of Gortyn in Crete with more independent legal rights in property and marriage than Athenian women enjoyed.


SEXUAL OFFENCES

If a person rapes a free person, male or female, he shall pay 100 staters, and if [the victim] is from the house of an apetarios, 10 staters; and if a slave rapes a free person, male or female, he shall pay double. If a free man rapes a serf, male or female, he shall pay 5 drachmas. If a male serf rapes a serf, male or female, he shall pay five staters.

If a person deflowers a female household serf, he shall pay 2 staters. If she has already been deflowered, 1 obol if in day-time, 2 obols if at night. The female slave’s oath takes precedence. If anyone makes an attempt to rape a free woman under the guardianship of a relative, he shall pay 10 staters, if a witness testifies.

If someone is taken in adultery with a free woman in her father’s house, or her brother’s or her husband’s, he is to pay 10 staters; if in another man’s house, 50 staters; if with the wife of an apetarios, 10 staters. But if a slave is taken in adultery with a free woman, he must pay double. If a slave is taken in adultery with a slave, 5 staters.

DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY IN DIVORCE

If a husband and wife divorce, she is to keep her property, whatever she brought to the marriage, and one-half the produce (if there is any) from her own property, and half of whatever she has woven within the house; also she is to have 5 staters if her husband is the cause of the divorce. If the husband swears that he is not the cause of the divorce, the judge is to take an oath and decide. If the wife carries away anything else belonging to the husband, she must pay 5 staters and whatever she carries away from him, and whatever she has stolen she must return to him. About what she denies [having taken], the judge is to order that she must swear by Artemis before the statue of [Artemis] Archeress in the Amyclean temple. If anyone takes anything from her after she has made her denial, he is to pay 5 staters and return the thing itself. If a stranger helps her to carry anything away, he must pay 10 staters and double the amount of whatever the judge swears that he helped her to take away.

WIDOWHOOD

If a man dies and leaves children behind, if the wife wishes, she may marry, keeping her own property and whatever her husband gave her according to an agreement written in the presence of three adult free witnesses. If she should take anything away that belongs to her children, that is grounds for a trial. If the husband leaves her without issue, she is to have her own property and half of whatever she has woven within the house, and she is to get her portion of the produce in the house along with the lawful heirs, and whatever her husband may have given her according to written agreement. But if she should take away anything else, it is grounds for a trial.

If a woman dies without issue the husband is to give her property back to her lawful heirs and half of what she has woven within and half of the produce if it comes from her property. If the husband or wife wishes to pay for its transport, it is to be in clothing or twelve staters or something worth 12 staters, but not more.

If a female serf is separated from a male serf while he is alive or if he dies, she is to keep what she has. If she takes anything else away, it is grounds for a trial.

---

1 A free man, but not a citizen, perhaps roughly equivalent in status to the Attic metoikos, ‘resident alien,’ who had more rights than a slave but fewer than a citizen.

2 Here and elsewhere in the Code, if oaths are sworn by both sides, the oath that has precedence wins by default; presumably, the oath was not merely an asseveration that one is telling the truth, but a solemn demand that the gods punish the swearer for lying.
PROVISIONS FOR CHILDREN IN CASE OF DEATH OR DIVORCE

If a wife who is separated from her husband should bear a child, it is to be brought to the husband in his house in the presence of three witnesses. If he does not receive it, it is up to the mother to raise or expose the child. The oath of relatives and witnesses is to have preference, if they brought it.

If a female serf should bear a child while separated [from her husband], she is to bring it to the master of the man who married her, in the presence of two witnesses. If he does not receive the child, it is to belong to the master of the female serf, but if she marries the same man again before the end of the year, the child shall belong to the master of the male serf. The oaths of person who brought the child and of the witnesses shall have preference.

If a divorced woman should expose her child before presenting it according to the law, she shall pay 50 staters for a free child, and 5 for a slave, if she is convicted. If the man to whom she brings the child has no house, or she does not see him, she shall not pay a penalty if she exposes the child.

If a female serf who is not married conceives and bears a child, the child shall belong to the master of her father. If the father is not alive then to the masters of her brothers.

The father has power over the children and division of property, and the mother over her own possessions. So long as [the father and mother] are alive, the property is not to be divided. But if one of them is fined, the person who is fined shall have his share reduced proportionately according to the law.

If a father dies, the city dwellings and whatever is inside the houses in which a serf who lives in the country does not reside, and the cattle which do not belong to a serf, shall belong to the sons. The other possessions shall be divided fairly, and the sons shall each get two parts, however many they are, and the daughters each get one part, however many they are.

The mother’s property shall also be divided if she dies, in the same way as prescribed for the father’s. But if there is no property other than the house, the daughters shall receive their share as prescribed. If the father during his lifetime should give to a married daughter, let him give her share as prescribed, but not more. The daughter to whom he gave or promised her share shall have it, but no additional possessions from her father’s property.

If any woman does not have property either from a gift by her father or brother or from a pledge or from an inheritance given when the Aithalian clan consisting of Cyllus and his colleagues [where in power], these women are to have a portion, but it will not be lawful to take away gifts given previously.

If a mother dies leaving children, the father has power over the mother’s estate, but he should not sell or mortgage it, unless the children are of age and give their consent. If he marries another wife, the children are to have power over their mother’s estate.

DETERMINATION OF SOCIAL STATUS

If a slave goes to a free woman and marries her, the children shall be free. If a free woman goes to a slave, the children shall be slaves.

HEIRESSES

The heiress is to marry the oldest of her father’s living brothers. If her father has no living brothers but there are sons of the brothers, she is to marry the oldest brother’s son. If there are more heiresses and sons of brothers, the [additional heiress] is to marry the next son after the son of the oldest. The groom-elect is to have one heiress, and not more.

If the heiress is too young to marry, she is to have the house, if there is one, and the groom-elect is to have half of the revenue from everything.

If he does not wish to marry her as prescribed by law, the heiress is to take all the property and marry the next one in succession, if there is one. If there is no one, she may marry whomever she wishes to of those who ask her from the same phratry. If the heiress is of age and does not wish to marry the intended bridgeroom, or the intended groom is too young and the heiress is unwilling to wait, she is to have the house, if there is one in the city, and whatever is in the house, and taking half of the remaining property she is to marry another of those from the phratry who ask her, but she is to give a share of the property to the groom [whom she rejected].
If there are no kinsmen as defined for the heiress, she is to take all the property and marry from the phratry whomever she wishes.

If no one from the phratry wishes to marry her, her relations should announce to the tribe ‘does anyone want to marry her?’ If someone wants to, it should be within thirty days of the announcement. If not, she is free to marry another man, whomever she can.

**RESTRICTIONS CONCERNING ADOPTION**

A woman is not to adopt [a child] nor a man under age.

**Questions:**
1. What rights did husbands and fathers have over their families in Crete?
2. Read document 2.5 “Education and Family Life in Sparta” and describe how these two documents illustrate the differences in the lives of women and the institution of marriage in these Greek city-states?
3. What do these documents reveal about the lives of servants or slaves in these societies?
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2.2 Homer from the Iliad

Homer’s Iliad, written around 800 B.C.E., tells the story of the Trojan War. In Homer’s telling, the Trojan war was not just a conflict between the armies of the Achaens and the Trojans, but a test of individual heroism, honor, and virtue. The passage included below explores the feud between Agamemnon, leader of the Achaens, and Achilles, his most powerful warrior.


Rage—Goddess, sing the rage of Peleus’ son Achilles, murderous, doomed, that cost the Achaens countless losses, hurling down to the House of Death so many sturdy souls, great fighters’ souls, but made their bodies carrion, feasts for the dogs and birds, and the will of Zeus was moving toward its end.

Begin, Muse, when the two first broke and clashed, Agamemnon lord of men and brilliant Achilles.

What god drove them to fight with such a fury? Apollo the son of Zeus and Leto. Incensed at the king he swept a fatal plague through the army—men were dying and all because Agamemnon spurned Apollo’s priest.

Yes, Chryses approached the Achaens’ fast ships to win his daughter back, bringing a priceless ransom and bearing high in hand, wound on a golden staff, the wreaths of the god, the distant deadly Archer. he begged the whole Achaean army but most of all the two supreme commanders, Atreus’ two sons, “Agamemnon, Menelaus—all Argives geared for war! May the Gods who hold the halls of Olympus give you Priam’s city to plunder, then safe passage home. Just set my daughter free, my dear one... he here, accept these gifts, this ransom. Honor the god who strikes from worlds away—the son of Zeus, Apollo!”

And all ranks of Achaens cried out their assent: “Respect the priest, accept the shining ransom!” But it brought no joy to the heart of Agamemnon. The king dismissed the priest with a brutal order ringing in his ears: “Never again, old man, let me catch sight of you by the hollow ships! Not loitering now, not slinking back tomorrow. The staff and the wreaths of god will never save you then. The girl—I won’t give up the girl. Long before that, old age will overtake her in my house, in Argos, far from her fatherland, slaving back and forth at the loom, forced to share my bed!

No go, don’t tempt my wrath—and you may depart alive.”

The old man was terrified. He obeyed the order, turning, trailing away in silence down the shore where the roaring battle lines of breakers crash and drag. And moving off to a safe distance, over and over the old priest prayed to the son of sleek-haired Leto,
lord Apollo, “Hear me, Apollo! God of the silver bow who strides the walls of Chryse and Cilla sacrosanct—
    lord in power of Tenedos—Smintheus,
god of the plague!

    If I ever roofed a shrine to please your heart,
ever burned the long rich bones of bulls and goats
on your holy altar, now, now bring my prayer to pass.
    Pay the Danaans back—your arrows for my tears!”

His prayer went up and Phoebus Apollo heard him.
Down he strode from Olympus’ peaks, storming at heart
with his bow and hooded quiver slung across his shoulders.
The arrows clanged at his back at the god quaked with rage,
the god himself on the march and down he came like night.
Over against the ships he dropped to a knee, let fly a shaft
and a terrifying clash rang out from the great silver bow.
First he went for the mules and circling dogs but then,
    launching a piercing shaft at the men themselves,
    he cut them down in droves—
and the corpse-fires burned on, night and day,
    no end in sight.

Nine days the arrows of god swept through the army.
On the tenth Achilles called all ranks to muster—
the impulse seized him, sent by white-armed Hera
    grieving to see Achaean fighters drop and die.
Once they’d gathered, crowding the meeting grounds,
the swift runner Achilles rose and spoke among them:
    “Son of Atreus, now we are beaten back, I fear,
the long campaign is lost. So home we sail . . .
if we can escape our death—if war and plague
are joining forces now to crush the Argives.
    But wait: let us question a holy man,
a prophet, even a man skilled with dreams—
dreams as well can come our way from Zeus—
come, someone to tell us why Apollo rages so,
    whether he blames us for a vow we failed, or sacrifice.
If only the god would share the smoky savor of limbs
and full-grown goats, Apollo might be willing, still,
    somehow, to save us from this plague.”

    So he proposed
and down he sat again as Calchas rose among them,
    Thestor’s son, the clearest by far of all the seers
who scan the flight of birds. He knew all things that are,
all things that are past and all that are to come,
the seer who had led the Argive ships to Troy
with the second sight that god Apollo gave him.
    For the armies’ good the seer began to speak:
    “Achilles, dear to Zeus . . .
you order me to explain Apollo’s anger,
    the distant deadly Archer? I will tell it all.
But strike a pact with me, swear you will defend me
with all your heart, with words and strength of hand.
    For there is a man I will enrage—I see it now—
a powerful man who lords it over all the Argives,
one the Achaeans must obey . . . A mighty king,
raging against an inferior, is too strong. 
Even if he can swallow down his wrath today,
still he will nurse the burning in his chest 
until, sooner or later, he sends it bursting forth.
Consider it closely, Achilles. Will you save me?”

And the matchless runner reassured him: “Courage!
Out with it now, Calchas. Reveal the will of god,
whatever you may know. And I swear by Apollo
dear to Zeus, the power you pray to, Calchas,
when you reveal god’s will to the Argives—no one,
not while I am alive and see the light on earth, no one will
lay his heavy hands on you by the hollow ships.
None among all the armies. Not even if you mean
Agamemnon here who now claims to be, by far,
the best of the Achaeans.”

The seer took heart
and this time he spoke out, bravely: “Beware—
he casts no blame for a vow we failed, a sacrifice.
The god’s enraged because Agamemnon spurned his priest,
he refused to free his daughter, he refused the ransom.
That’s why the Archer sends us pains
and he will send us more
and never drive this shameful destruction from the Argives,
not till we give back the girl with sparkling eyes
to her loving father—no price, no ransom paid—
and carry a sacred hundred bulls to Chryse town.
Then we can calm the god, and only then appease him.”

Questions:
1. What is the role of the Gods in this reading?
2. What virtues are important to the ancient Greeks?
2.3 Historical Methods: Thucydides

Thucydides’ great historical work was his History of the Peloponnesian Wars that he experienced firsthand. Here he explains his reason for writing about them and the method he pursued in the task.


Book One: Introduction

Thucydides the Athenian wrote the history of the war fought between Athens and Sparta, beginning the account at the very outbreak of the war, in the belief that it was going to be a great war and more worth writing about than any of those which had taken place in the past. My belief was based on the fact that the two sides were at the very height of their power and preparedness and I saw, too, that the rest of the Hellenic world was committed to one side or the other; even those who were not immediately engaged were deliberating on the courses which they were to take later. This was the greatest disturbance in the history of the Hellenes, affecting also a large part of the non-Hellenic world, and indeed, I might almost say, the whole of mankind. For though I have found it impossible, because of its remoteness in time, to acquire a really precise knowledge of the distant past or even of the history preceding our own period, yet, after looking back into it as far as I can, all the evidence leads me to conclude that these periods were not great periods either in warfare or in anything else.

It appears, for example, that the country now called Hellas had no settled population in ancient times; instead there was a series of migrations, as the various tribes, being under the constant pressure of invaders who were stronger than they were, were always prepared to abandon their own territory. There was no commerce, and no safe communication either by land or sea; the use they made of their land was limited to the production of necessities; they had no surplus left over for capital, and no regular system of agriculture, since they lacked the protection of fortifications and at any moment an invader might appear and take their land away from them. Thus, in the belief that the day-to-day necessities of life could be secured just as well in one place as in another, they showed no reluctance in moving from their homes, and therefore built no cities of any size or strength, nor acquired any important resources....

In investigating past history, and in forming the conclusions which I have formed, it must be admitted that one cannot rely on every detail which has come down to us by way of tradition. People are inclined to accept all stories of ancient times in an uncritical way—even when these stories concern their own native countries. Most people in Athens, for instance, are under the impression that Hipparochus, who was killed by Harmodius and Aristogeiton, was tyrant at the time, not realizing that it was Hippias who was the eldest and the chief of the sons of Pisistratus, and that Hipparchus and Thesalus were his younger brothers. What happened was this; on the very day that had been fixed for their attempt, indeed at the very last moment, Harmodius and Aristogeiton had reason to believe that Hippias had been informed of the plot by some of the conspirators. Believing him to have been forewarned, they kept away from him, but, as they wanted to perform some daring exploit before they were arrested themselves, they killed Hipparchus when they found him by the Leocorium organizing the Panathenaic procession.

The rest of the Hellenes, too, make many incorrect assumptions not only about the dimly remembered past, but also about contemporary history. For instance, there is a general belief that the kings of Sparta are each entitled to two votes, whereas in fact they have only one; and it is believed, too, that the Spartans have a company of troops called ‘Pitanate’. Such a company has never existed. Most people in fact, will not take trouble in finding out the truth, but are much more inclined to accept the first story they hear.

However, I do not think that one will be far wrong in accepting the conclusions I have reached from the evidence which I have put forward. It is better evidence than that of the poets, who exaggerate the importance of their themes, or of the prose chroniclers, who are less interested in telling the truth than in catching the attention of their public, whose authorities cannot be checked, and whose subject-matter, owing to the passage of time, is mostly lost in the unreliable streams of mythology. We may claim instead to have used only the plainest evidence and to have reached conclusions which are reasonably accurate, considering that we have been dealing with ancient history. As for this present war, even though people are apt to think that the war in which they are fighting is the greatest of all wars and, when it is over, to relapse again into their admiration of the past, nevertheless, if one looks at the facts themselves, one will see that this was the greatest war of all.

In this history I have made use of set speeches some of which were delivered just before and others during the war. I have found it difficult to remember the precise words used in the speeches which I listened to myself and my various informants have experienced the same difficulty; so my method has been, while keeping as closely as possible to the general sense of the words that were actually used, to make the speakers say what in my opinion, was called for by each situation....
And with regard to my factual reporting of the events of the war I have made it a principle not to write down the first story that came my way, and not even to be guided by my own general impressions; either I was present myself at the events which I have described or else I heard of them from eye-witnesses whose reports I have checked with as much thoroughness as possible. Not that even so the truth was easy to discover: different eye-witnesses give different accounts of the same events, speaking out of partiality for one side or the other or else from imperfect memories. And it may well be that my history will seem less easy to read because of the absence in it of a romantic element. It will be enough for me, however, if these words of mine are judged useful by those who want to understand clearly the events which happened in the past and which (human nature being what it is) will, at some time or other and in much the same ways, be repeated in the future. My work is not a piece of writing designed to meet the taste of an immediate public, but was done to last forever.

Questions:
1. What is Thucydides' goal and what method did he use to reach it?
2. If Thucydides were to apply his method of examination to our own state and history, how do you think he would be regarded by the public?
2.4 Tyrtaeus, The Spartan Creed

Tyrtaeus (7th century B.C.E.) was a Greek poet who lived in Sparta. Many of his poems were meant to inspire the Spartans to victory in war. Some say he was a Spartan general, but according to Athenian legend he was a lame schoolmaster.


I would not say anything for a man nor take account of him for any speed of his feet or wrestling skill he might have, not if he had the size of a Cyclops and strength to go with it, not if he could outrun Bóreas, the North Wind of Thrace, not if he were more handsome and gracefully formed than Tithónos, or had more riches than Midas had, or Kínyras too, not if he were more of a king than Tantalid Pelops, or had the power of speech and persuasion Adrastos had, not if he had all splendors except for a fighting spirit. For no man ever proves himself a good man in war unless he can endure to face the blood and the slaughter, go close against the enemy and fight with his hands. Here is courage, mankind’s finest possession, here is the noblest prize that a young man can endeavor to win, and it is a good thing his city and all the people share with him when a man plants his feet and stands in the foremost spears relentlessly, all thought of foul flight completely forgotten, and has well trained his heart to be steadfast and to endure, and with words encourages the man who is stationed beside him. Here is a man who proves himself to be valiant in war. With a sudden rush he turns to flight the rugged battalions of the enemy, and sustains the beating waves of assault. And he who so falls among the champions and loses his sweet life, so blessing with honor his city, his father, and all his people, with wounds in his chest, where the spear that he was facing has transfixed that massive guard of his shield, and gone through his breastplate as well, why, such a man is lamented alike by the young and the elders, and all his city goes into mourning and grieves for his loss. His tomb is pointed to with pride, and so are his children, and his children’s children, and afterward all the race that is his. His shining glory is never forgotten, his name is remembered, and he becomes an immortal, though he lies under the ground, when one who was a brave man has been killed by the furious War God standing his ground and fighting hard for his children and land. But if he escapes the doom of death, the destroyer of bodies, and wins his battle, and bright renown for the work of his spear, all men give place to him alike, the youth and the elders, and much joy comes his way before he goes down to the dead.
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Aging, he has reputation among his citizens. No one tries to interfere with his honors or
all he deserves;
all men withdraw before his presence, and yield their seats to him, the youth, and the
men his age, and even those older than he.
Thus a man should endeavor to reach this high place of courage with all his heart, and,
so trying, never be backward in war.

Translated by Richmond Lattimore.

Question:
1. What is the main virtue of the Spartan citizen?
2.5 Education and the Family in Sparta

By the fifth century B.C.E. in Athens, young men of respectable family were educated at schools and by tutors to be good citizens and daughters were rarely educated beyond their domestic duties in the household. All children’s lives and their educations remained under the control of their fathers. Sparta developed an entirely different system for raising their next generation of citizens.


In order to the good education of their youth (which, as I said before, he thought the most important and noblest work of a lawgiver), [Lycurgus] went so far back as to take into consideration their very conception and birth, by regulating their marriages. For Aristotle is wrong in saying, that, after he had tried all ways to reduce the women to more modesty and sobriety, he was at last forced to leave them as they were, because that, in the absence of their husbands, who spent the best part of their lives in the wars, their wives, whom they were obliged to leave absolute mistresses at home, took great liberties and assumed the superiority; and were treated with overmuch respect and called by the title of lady or queen. The truth is, he took in their case, also, all the care that was possible; he ordered the maidens to exercise themselves with wrestling, running, throwing the quoit, and casting the dart, to the end that the fruit they conceived might, in strong and healthy bodies, take firmer root and find better growth, and withal that they, with this greater vigor, might be the more able to undergo the pains of child-bearing. And to the end he might take away their over-great tenderness and fear of exposure to the air, and all acquired womanishness, he ordered that the young women should go naked in the processions, as well as the young men, and dance, too, in that condition, at certain solemn feasts, singing certain songs, whilst the young men stood around, seeing and hearing them. On these occasions, they now and then made, by jests, a befitting reflection upon those who had misbehaved themselves in the wars; and again sang encomiums upon those who had done any gallant action, and by these means inspired the younger sort with an emulation of their glory. Those that were thus commended went away proud, elated, and gratified with their honor among the maidens; and those who were rallied were as sensibly touched with it ‘As if they had been formally reprimanded; and so much the more, because the kings and the elders, as well as the rest of the city, saw and heard all that passed. Nor was there any thing shameful in this nakedness of the young women; modesty attended them, and all wantonness was excluded. It taught them simplicity and a care for good health, and gave them some taste of higher feelings, admitted as they thus were to the field of noble action and glory. Hence it was natural for them to think and speak as Gorgo, for example, the wife of Leonidas, is said to have done, when -some foreign lady, as it would seem, told her that the women of Lacedæmon were the only women of the world who could rule men; “With good reason,” she said, “for we are the only women who bring forth men.”

These public processions of the maidens, and their appearing naked in their exercises and dancings, were incitements to marriage, operating upon the young with the rigor and certainty, as Plato says, of love, if not of mathematics. But besides all this, to promote it yet more effectually, those who continued bachelors were in a degree disfranchised by law; for they were excluded from the sight of those public processions in which the young men and maidens danced naked, and, in wintertime, the officers compelled them to march naked themselves round the market-place, singing as they went a certain song to their own disgrace, that they justly suffered this punishment for disobeying the laws. Moreover, they were denied that respect and observance which the younger men paid their elders; and no man, for example, found fault with what was said to Dercyllidas, though so eminent a commander; upon whose approach one day, a young man, instead of rising, retained his seat, remarking, “No child of yours will make room for me.”
In their marriages, the husband carried off his bride by a sort of force; nor were their brides ever small and of tender years, but in their full bloom and ripeness. After this, she who superintended the wedding comes and clips the hair of the bride close round her head, dresses her up in man’s clothes, and leaves her upon a mattress in the dark; afterwards comes the bridegroom, in his every-day clothes, sober and composed, as having supped at the common table, and, entering privately into the room where the bride lies, unties her virgin zone, and takes her to himself; and, after staying some time together, he returns composedly to his own apartment, to sleep as usual with the other young men. And so he continues to do, spending his days, and, indeed, his nights with them, visiting his bride in fear and shame, and with circumspection, when he thought he should not be observed; she, also, on her part, using her wit to help and find favorable opportunities for their meeting, when company was out of the way. In this manner they lived a long time, insomuch that they sometimes had children by their wives before ever they saw their faces by daylight. Their interviews, being thus difficult and rare, served not only for continual exercise of their self-control, but brought them together with their bodies healthy and vigorous, and their affections fresh and lively, unsated and undulled by easy access and long continuance with each other; while their partings were always early enough to leave behind unextinguished in each of them some remainder fire of longing and mutual delight. After guarding marriage with this modesty and reserve, he was equally careful to banish empty and womanish jealousy. For this object, excluding all licentious disorders, he made it, nevertheless, honorable for men to give the use of their wives to those whom they should think fit, that so they might have children by them; ridiculing those in whose opinion such favors are so unfit for participation as to fight and shed blood and go to war about it. Lycurgus allowed a man who was advanced in years and had a young wife to recommend some virtuous and approved young man, that she might have a child by him, who might inherit the good qualities of the father, and be a son to himself. On the other side, an honest man who had love for a married woman upon account of her modesty and the wellfavoredness of her children, might, without formality, beg her company of her husband, that he might raise, as it were, from this plot of good ground, worthy and well-allied children for himself. And, indeed, Lycurgus was of a persuasion that children were not so much the property of their parents as of the whole commonwealth, and, therefore, would not have his citizens begot by the first comers, but by the best men that could be found; the laws of other nations seemed to him very absurd and inconsistent, where people would be so solicitous for their dogs and horses as to exert interest and pay money to procure fine breeding, and yet kept their wives shut up, to be made mothers only by themselves, who might be foolish, infirm, or diseased; as if it were not apparent that children of a bad breed would prove their bad qualities first upon those who kept and were rearing them, and well-born children, in like manner, their good qualities.

... Nor was it in the power of the father to dispose of the child as he thought fit; he was obliged to carry it before certain triers at a place called Lesche; these were some of the elders of the tribe to which the child belonged; their business it was carefully to view the infant, and, if they found it stout and well made, they gave order for its rearing, and allotted to it one of the nine thousand shares of land above mentioned for its maintenance, but, if they found it puny and ill-shaped, ordered it to be taken to what was called the Apothetæ, a sort of chasm under Taygetus; as thinking it neither for the good of the child itself; nor for the public interest, that it should be brought up, if it did not, from the very outset, appear made to be healthy and vigorous. Upon the same account, the women did not bathe the new-born children with water, as is the custom in all other countries, but with wine, to prove the temper and complexion of their bodies; from a notion they had that epileptic and weakly children faint and waste away upon their being thus bathed, while, on the contrary, those of strong and vigorous habit acquire firmness and get a temper by it, like steel. There was much care and art, too, used by the nurses; they had no swaddling bands; the children grew up free and unconstrained in limb and form, and not dainty and fanciful about their food; not afraid in the dark, or of being left alone; without any peevishness or ill humor or crying....

... Nor was it lawful, indeed, for the father himself to breed up the children after his own fancy; but as soon as they were seven years old they were to be enrolled in certain companies and classes, where they all lived under the same order and discipline, doing their exercises and taking their play together. Of these, he who showed the most conduct and courage was made captain; they had their eyes always upon him, obeyed his orders, and underwent patiently whatsoever punishment he inflicted; so that the whole course of their education was one continued exercise of a ready and perfect obedience. The old men, too, were spectators of their performances, and often raised quarrels and disputes among them, to have a good opportunity of finding out their different characters, and of seeing which would be valiant, which a coward, when they should come to more dangerous encounters. Reading and writing they gave them, just enough to serve their turn; their chief care was to make them good subjects, and to teach them to endure pain and conquer in battle. To this end, as they grew in years, their discipline was proportionally increased; their heads were close-clipped, they were accustomed to go bare-foot, and for the most part to play naked.
After they were twelve years old, they were no longer allowed to wear any under-garment; they had one coat to serve them a year; their bodies were hard and dry, with but little acquaintance of baths and unguents; these human indulgences they were allowed only on some few particular days in the year. They lodged together in little bands upon beds made of the rushes which grew by the banks of the river Eurotas, which they were to break off with their hands without a knife; if it were winter, they mingled some thistle-down with their rushes, which it was thought had the property of giving warmth. By the time they were come to this age, there was not any of the more hopeful boys who had not a lover to bear him company. The old men, too, had an eye upon them, coming often to the grounds to hear and see them contend either in wit or strength with one another, and this as seriously and with as much concern as if they were their fathers, their tutors, or their magistrates; so that there scarcely was any time or place without some one present to put them in mind of their duty, and punish them if they had neglected it.

Besides all this, there was always one of the best and honestest men in the city appointed to undertake the charge and governance of them; he again arranged them into their several bands, and set over each of them for their captain the most temperate and boldest of those... who were usually twenty years old.... This young man, therefore, was their captain when they fought, and their master at home, using them for the offices of his house; sending the oldest of them to fetch wood, and the weaker and less able, to gather salads and herbs, and these they must either go without or steal; which they did by creeping into the gardens, or conveying themselves cunningly and closely into the eating-houses; if they were taken in the fact, they were whipped without mercy, for thieving so ill and awkwardly. They stole, too, all other meat they could lay their hands on, looking out and watching all opportunities, when people were asleep or more careless than usual. If they were caught, they were not only punished with whipping, but hunger, too, being reduced to their ordinary allowance, which was but very slender, and so contrived on purpose, that they might set about to help themselves, and be forced to exercise their energy and address. This was the principal design of their hard fare; there was another not inconsiderable, that they might grow taller; for the vital spirits, not being overburdened and oppressed by too great a quantity of nourishment, which necessarily discharges itself into thickness and breadth, do, by their natural lightness, rise; and the body, giving and yielding because it is pliant, grows in height. The same thing seems, also, to conduce to beauty of shape;...

They taught them, also, to speak with a natural and graceful raillery, and to comprehend much matter of thought in few words. For Lycurgus, who ordered, as we saw, that a great piece of money should be but of an inconsiderable value, on the contrary would allow no discourse to be current which did not contain in few words a great deal of useful and curious sense; children in Sparta, by a habit of long silence, came to give just and sententious answers; for, indeed, as loose and incontinent livers are seldom fathers of many children, so loose and incontinent talkers seldom originate many sensible words. King Agis, when some Athenian laughed at their short swords, and said that the jugglers on the stage swallowed them with ease, answered him, “We find them long enough to reach our enemies with;” and as their swords were short and sharp, so, it seems to me, were their sayings....

... Nor was their instruction in music and verse less carefully attended to than their habits of grace and good breeding in conversation. And their very songs had a life and spirit in them that inflamed and possessed men’s minds with an enthusiasm and ardor for action; the style of them was plain and without affectation; the subject always serious and moral; most usually, it was in praise of such men as had died in defence of their country, or in derision of those that had been cowards; the former they declared happy and glorified; the life of the latter they described as most miserable and abject. There were also vaunts of what they would do and boasts of what they had done...

Their discipline continued still after they were full-grown men. No one was allowed to live after his own fancy; but the city was a sort of camp, in which every man had his share of provisions and business set out, and looked upon himself not so much born to serve his own ends as the interest of his country. Therefore, if they were commanded nothing else, they went to see the boys perform their exercises, to teach them something useful, or to learn it themselves of those who knew better. And, indeed, one of the greatest and highest blessings Lycurgus procured his people was the abundance of leisure, which proceeded from his forbidding to them the exercise of any mean and mechanical trade. Of the money-making that depends on troublesome going about and seeing people and doing business, they had no need at all in a state where wealth obtained no honor or respect. The Helots tilled their ground for them, and paid them yearly in kind the appointed quantity, without any trouble of theirs.... So much beneath them did they esteem the frivolous devotion of time and attention to the mechanical arts and to money-making.
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... To conclude, he bred up his citizens in such a way that they neither would nor could live by themselves; they were to make themselves one with the public good, and, clustering like bees around their commander, be by their zeal and public spirit carried all but out of themselves, and devoted wholly to their country.

He filled Lacedæmon all through with roofs and examples of good conduct; with the constant sight of which from their youth up, the people would hardly fail to be gradually formed and advanced in virtue.

And this was the reason why he forbade them to travel abroad, and go about acquainting themselves with foreign rules of morality, the habits of ill-educated people, and different views of government.... He was as careful to save his city from the infection of foreign bad habits, as men usually are to prevent the introduction of a pestilence.

Questions:
1. What rights did husbands and fathers have over their families in Sparta?
2. Read document 2.1, “Laws Relating to Women: Excerpts from the Gortyn Law Code” and describe how these documents illustrate the differences in the lives of women and the institution of marriage in Crete and Sparta.
3. What do these documents reveal about the lives of servants or slaves in these societies?
2.6 Poetry: Sappho

Sappho, believed to have been born about 612 B.C.E., wrote exquisite poetry praised throughout the ages for its perfection. Mother, wife, poet, dancer, teacher, Sappho’s character has long been a subject for debate. In her sixth century B.C.E. society, respectable women attended school and enjoyed far more freedoms than their nearly cloistered fifth century Athenian sisters.


24 Reverence for Beauty

For when I look upon you face to face, then I see in you
such beauty as not even Hermione possessed,
but I compare you with auburn-haired Helen,
rather than with mortal maids—though even
that is only a guess.

But understand this, that I am so struck with
your beauty that I can only render honour to it with the
sacrifice of my mind, and reverence you with my desire
for your company.

77 Social Climbing (A Letter to Her Brother, Charaxos)

If you crawl round the feet of the great instead of the beautiful and the good, and bid your friends farewell, and in the swollen pride of your heart say that I have become a disgrace to you—with such things you can flatter your heart. Feed your fill! For my mind is not so softly moved by the petulance of a child! But make no mistake. The snare never catches the old bird. I have put two and two together and know well the depth of your former villainy, and what sort of enemy I am up against. So turn your mind to better thoughts.

For, assuredly, I know that having been brought up to be kindly of heart, I have the Blessed Ones on my side.

35 To Her Pupils

You slight the fair gifts of the
deep-bosomed Muses, children,
when you say ‘We will crown
you, dear [Sappho], as first of
singers with the clear sweet
voice’.

Do you not realise that age has
wrinkled all my skin, that my
hair has become white from
being black, and that I have
hardly any teeth left; or that my
knees can no longer carry my body back
again to the old days when
I joined in the dance, like
the fawns, the nimblest
of living things?

But what can I do? Not even
God himself can do what
cannot be done. And, for us, as
unfailingly as starry
night follows rosy-armed
morning, and brings darkness to the
furthest ends of the earth, so
death tracks down and
overtakes every living thing;
and as he himself would not
give Orpheus his dearest wife,
so is he ever used to keep
prisoner every woman whom
he overtakes, even if he should
make her follow her spouse with
his singing and piping.

But listen now-I love
delicate living, and for me
brightness and beauty and a longing
for the sunlight have been
given me as a protection.
And, therefore, I have no
intention of departing to the
Grace of God before I need,
but will lovingly pursue my
life with you who love me.

And now this is enough
for me that I have your
love, and I desire no more.

51 THE APPLE

As the sweet apple reddens on
the top of the bough,
On the very topmost twig,
Which the apple-pickers had forgotten-
No, not forgotten, but
they could not reach it!

52 THE BLUEBELLS

As on the slopes, shepherd-men
trampled the bluebells underfoot,
and the flowers stain the earth with
colour.

60 THE GIRDLE

She wore an embroidered leather
girdle, the ends of which reached
down to her feet, a beautiful
piece of Lydian workmanship.

61 LOVE-SICKNESS

Sweet Mother, I cannot play the loom,
For I am overcome by my desire for a boy;
And all the fault of tender Aphrodite!
62 SELF RESTRAINT

When anger spread through your breast, guard your tongue from nagging.

65 THE FISHERMAN

On the grave of Pelagon, the fisherman, his father Meniscos placed a net and oar-witnesses to his life of toil.

66 EPITaph

Here lies the dust of Timas, who died upon her wedding eve; Persephone took her into her sea-dark chamber. And when she died, all her companions sheared their lovely locks with the sharp steel And placed them on her tomb.

67 DEATH

Death is an evil. The gods have judged it so. For otherwise they had died themselves.

68 THE PHILISTINE

Thou shalt be dead for ever. Nor shall anything be remembered of thee either now or at any time. For thou hast scorned the roses of Poetry; Therefore shalt thou go wandering about among the feeble ghosts in the halls of Death.

Question:
1. What are the themes and topics of Sappho’s poetry? What do they reveal about her life?
2.7 **Alcaeus, Late 7th Century—Middle 6th Century B.C.**

A contemporary and associate of Sappho, Alcaeus of Lesbos was an aristocrat and poet. His work reflects the violence and chaos of the times in which he lived. His poetry ranged from political odes to drinking songs.


1

Wash your gullet with wine for the Dog-Star returns
with the heat of summer searing a thirsting earth.
Cicadas cry softly under high leaves, and pour down
shril song incessantly from under their wings.
The artichoke blooms, and women are warn and wanton—
but men turn lean and limp for the burning Dog-
Star parches their brains and knees.

2

Come with me now and leave the land of
Pelops, mighty sons of Zeus and Leda,
and in kindness spread your light on us,
    Kastor and Polydeukes.
You who wander above the long earth
and over all the seas on swift horses,
easily delivering mariners
from pitiful death,
    fly to the masthead of our swift ship,
and gazing over foramast and forestays,
light a clear path through the midnight gloom
    for our black vessel.

3

You have come home from the ends of the earth,
Antimenidas, my dear brother; come
with a gold and ivory handle to your sword.
You fought alongside the Babylonians
and your prowess saved them from annihilation
when you battled and cut down a warrior giant
who was almost eight feet tall.

4

One and all,
you have proclaimed Pittakos, the lowborn,
to be tyrant of your lifeless and doomed
land. Moreover, you deafen him with praise.

*Translated by Willis Barnstone*
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5
The great hall is aglare with bronze armament and the whole inside made fit for war with helms glittering and hung high, crested over with white horse-manes that nod and wave and make splendid the heads of men who wear them. Here are shining greaves made out of bronze, hung on hooks, and they cover all the house’s side. They are strong to stop arrows and spears. Hear are war-jackets quilted close of new linen, with hollow shields stacked on the floor, with broad swords of the Chalkis make, many tunics and many belts heaped close beside. These shall not lie neglected, now we have stood to our task and have this work to do.

6
I cannot understand how the winds are set against each other. Now from the side and now from that the waves roll. We between them run with the wind in our black ship driven, hard pressed and laboring under the giant storm. All round the mast-step washes the sea we shipped. You can see through the sail already where there are opening rents within it. The forestays slacken....

7
Zeus rains upon us, and from the sky comes down enormous winter. Rivers have turned to ice.... Dash down the winter. Throw a log on the fire and mix the flattering wine (do not water it too much) and bind on round our foreheads soft ceremonial wreaths of spun fleece. We must not let our spirits give way to grief. By being sorry we get no further on, my Bukchis. Best of all defenses is to mix plenty of wine, and drink it.

Translated by Richmond Lattimore

Question:
1. Alcaeus was a member of the artistocracy writing during turbulent times. How is this reflected in this section?
PART 3
Classical and Hellenistic Civilization

3.1 The Apology from Plato

A pupil of Socrates and Aristotle's teacher, Plato (c. 427-347 B.C.E.) is one of the most influential thinkers in the history of Western Civilization. His ideas about the nature of existence and virtue played important roles in the development of Western philosophy, science, and theology. In *The Apology* Plato presents a defense of his mentor Socrates.


Very well, then, I must begin my defense, gentlemen, and I must try, in the short time that I have, to rid your minds of a false impression which is the work of many years. I should like this to be the result, gentlemen, assuming it to be for your advantage and my own; and I should like to be successful in my defense, but I think that it will be difficult, and I am quite aware of the nature of my task. However, let that turn out as God wills. I must obey the law and make my defense.

Let us go back to the beginning and consider what the charge is that has made me so unpopular, and has encouraged Meletus to draw up this indictment. Very well, what did my critics say in attacking my character? I must read out their affidavit, so to speak, as though they were my legal accusers: Socrates is guilty of criminal meddling, in that he inquires into things below the earth and in the sky, and makes the weaker argument defeat the stronger, and teachers others to follow his example. It runs something like that. You have seen it for yourselves in the play by Aristophanes, where Socrates goes whirling round, proclaiming that he is walking on air, and uttering a great deal of other nonsense about things of which I know nothing whatsoever. I mean no disrespect for such knowledge, if anyone really is versed in it—I do not want any more lawsuits brought against me by answer questions for rich and poor alike, and I am equally ready if anyone prefers to listen to me and answer my questions. If any given one of these people becomes a good citizen or a bad one, I cannot fairly be held responsible, since I have never promised or imparted any teaching to anybody, and if anyone asserts that he has ever learned or heard from me privately anything which was not open to everyone else, you may be quite sure that he is not telling the truth.

But how is it that some people enjoy spending a great deal of time in my company? You have heard the reason, gentlemen; I told you quite frankly. It is because they enjoy hearing me examine those who think that they are wise when they are not—an experience which has its amusing side. This duty I have accepted, as I said, in obedience to God's commands given in oracles and dreams and in every other way that any other divine dispensation has ever impressed a duty upon man. This is a true statement, gentlemen, and easy to verify. If it is a fact that I am in process of corrupting some of the young, and have succeeded already in corrupting others, and if it were a fact that some of the latter, being now grown up, had discovered that I had ever given them bad advice when they were young, surely they ought now to be coming forward to denounce and punish me. And if they did not like to do it themselves, you would expect some of their families— their fathers and brothers and other near relations—to remember it now, if their own flesh and blood had suffered any harm from me. Certainly a great many of them have found their way into this court, as I can see for myself—first Crito over there, my contemporary and near neighbor, the father of this young man Critobulus, and then Lysanias of Sphettus, the father of Sphettus, the father of Aeschines here, and next Antipho of Cephisus, over there, the father of Epigenes. Then besides there are all those whose brothers have been members of our circle—Nicostratus, the son of Theozotides, the brother of Theodotus, but Theodotus is dead, so he cannot appeal to his brother, and Paralus here, the son of Demodocus, whose brother was Theages. And here is Adimantus, the son of Ariston, whose brother Plato is over there, and Aeantodorus, whose brother Apollodorus is here on this side. I can name many more besides, some of whom Meletus most certainly ought to have produced as witnesses in the course of his speech. If he forgot to do so then, let him do it now—I am willing to make way for him. Let him state whether he has any such evidence to offer. On the contrary, gentlemen, you will find that they are all prepared to help me—the corrupter and evil genius of their nearest and dearest relatives, as Meletus and Anytus say. The actual victims of my corrupting influence might perhaps be excused for helping me; but as for the uncorrupted, their relations of mature age, what other reason can they have for helping me except the right and proper one, that they know Meletus is lying and I am telling the truth?

Questions:
1. What is the mission of Socrates?
2. Why does it arouse such opposition?
3.2 Aristotle, *Nichomachean Ethics*

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.) was born in the Greek town of Stagira. After studying under Plato at the Academy, he tutored Alexander the Great and then opened a school of his own in the Lyceum in Athens. In the selection from the *Nichomachean Ethics* included below, Aristotle defines virtue and vice.


5 Next we must consider what virtue is. Since things that are found in the soul are of three kinds—passions, faculties, states of character, virtue must be one of these. By passions I mean appetite, anger, fear, confidence, envy, joy, friendly feeling, hatred, longing, emulation, pity, and in general the feelings that are accompanied by pleasure or pain; by faculties the things in virtue of which we are said to be capable of feeling these, e.g. of becoming angry or being pained or feeling pity; by states of character the things in virtue of which we stand well or badly with reference to the passions, e.g. with reference to anger we stand badly if we feel it violently or too weakly, and well if we feel it moderately; and similarly with reference to the other passions.

Now neither the virtues nor the vices are passions, because we are not called good or bad on the ground of our passions, but are so called on the ground of our virtues and our vices, and because we are neither praised nor blamed for our passions (for the man who feels fear or anger is not praised, nor is the man who simply feels anger blamed, but the man who feels it in a certain way), but for our virtues and our vices are praised or blamed.

Again, we feel anger and fear without choice, but the virtues are modes of choice or involve choice. Further, in respect of the passions we are said to be moved, but in respect of the virtues and the vices we are said not to be moved but to be disposed in a particular way.

For these reasons also they are not *faculties*; for we are neither called good nor bad, nor praised or blamed, for the simple capacity of feeling the passions; again, we have the faculties by nature, but we are not made good or bad by nature; we have spoken of this before.

If, then, the virtues are neither passions nor faculties, all that remains is that they should be *states of character*.

Thus we have stated what virtue is in respect of its genus.

6 We must, however, not only describe virtue as a state of character, but also say what sort of state it is. We may remark, then, that every virtue or excellence both brings into good condition the thing of which it is the excellence and makes the work of that thing be done well; e.g. the excellence of the eye makes both the eye and its work good; for it is by the excellence of the eye that we see well. Similarly the excellence of the horse makes a horse both good in itself and good at running and at carrying its rider and at awaiting the attack of the enemy. Therefore, if this is true in every case, the virtue of man also will be the state of character which makes a man good and which makes him do his own work well.

How this is to happen we have stated already, but it will be made plain also by the following consideration of the specific nature of virtue. In everything that is continuous and divisible it is possible to take more, less, or an equal amount, and that either in terms of the thing itself or relatively to us; and the equal is an intermediate between excess and defect. By the intermediate in the object I mean that which is equidistant from each of the extremes, which is one and the same for all men; by the intermediate relatively to us that which is neither too much nor too little—and this is not one, nor the same for all. For instance, if ten is many and two is few, six is the intermediate, taken in terms of the object; for it exceeds and is exceeded by an equal amount; this is intermediate according to arithmetical proportion. But the intermediate relatively to us is not to be taken so; if ten pounds are too much for a particular person to eat and two too little, it does not follow that the trainer will order six pounds; for this also is perhaps too much for the person who is to take it, or too little—too little for Milo, too much for the beginner in athletic exercises. The same is true of running and wrestling. Thus a master of any art avoids excess and defect, but seeks the intermediate and chooses this—the intermediate not in the object but relatively to us.

If it is thus, then, that every art does its work well—by looking to the intermediate and judging its works by this standard (so that we often say of good works of art that it is not possible either to take away or to add anything, implying that excess and defect destroy the goodness of works of art, while the mean preserves it; and good artists, as we say, look to this in their work), and if, further, virtue is more exact and better than any art, as nature also is, then virtue must have the quality of aiming at the intermediate. I mean moral virtue; for it is this that is concerned with passions and actions, and
in these there is excess, defect, and the intermediate. For instance, both fear and confidence and appetite and anger and pity and in general pleasure and pain may be felt both too much and too little, and in both cases not well; but to feel them at the right times, with reference to the right objects, towards the right people, with the right motive, and in the right way, is what is both intermediate and best, and this is characteristic of virtue. Similarly with regard to actions also there is excess, defect, and the intermediate. Now virtue is concerned with passions and actions, in which excess is a form of failure, and so is defect, while the intermediate is praised and is a form of success; and being praised and being successful are both characteristics of virtue. Therefore virtue is a kind of mean, since, as we have seen, it aims at what is intermediate.

Again, it is possible to fail in many ways (for evil belongs to the class of the unlimited, as the Pythagoreans conjectured, and good to that of the limited), while to succeed is possible only in one way (for which reason also one is easy and the other difficult—to miss the mark easy, to hit it difficult); for these reasons also, then, excess and defect are characteristic of vice, and the mean of virtue;

For men are good in but one way, but bad in many.

Virtue, then, is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean, i.e. the mean relative to us, this being determined by a rational principle, and by that principle by which the man of practical wisdom would determine it. Now it is a mean between two vices, that which depends on excess and that which depends on defect; and again it is a mean because the vices respectively fall short of or exceed what is right in both passions and actions, while virtue both finds and chooses that which is intermediate. Hence in respect of its substance and the definition which states its essence virtue is a mean, with regard to what is best and right an extreme.

But not every action nor every passion admits of a mean; for some have names that already imply badness, e.g. spite, shamelessness, envy, and in the case of actions adultery, theft, murder; for all of these and suchlike things imply by their names that they are themselves bad, and not the excesses or deficiencies of them. It is not possible, then, ever to be right with regard to them; one must always be wrong. Nor does goodness or badness with regard to such things depend on committing adultery with the right woman, at the right time, and in the right way, but simply to do any of them is to go wrong. It would be equally absurd, then, to expect that in unjust, cowardly, and voluptuous action there should be a mean, an excess, and a deficiency; for at that rate there would be a mean of excess and of deficiency, an excess of excess, and a deficiency of deficiency. But as there is no excess and deficiency of temperance and courage because what is intermediate is in a sense an extreme, so too of the actions we have mentioned there is no mean nor any excess and deficiency, but however they are done they are wrong; for in general there is neither a mean of excess and deficiency, nor excess and deficiency of a mean.

We must, however, not only make this general statement, but also apply it to the individual facts. For among statements about conduct those which are general apply more widely, but those which are particular are more genuine, since conduct has to do with individual cases, and our statements must harmonize with the facts in these cases. We may take these cases from our table. With regard to feelings of fear and confidence courage is the mean; of the people who exceed, he who exceeds in fearlessness has no name (many of the states have no name), while the man who exceeds in confidence is rash, and he who exceeds in fear and falls short in confidence is a coward. With regard to pleasures and pains—not all of them, and not so much with regard to the pains—the mean is temperance, the excess self-indulgence. Persons deficient with regard to the pleasures are not often found; hence such persons also have received no name. But let us call them ‘insensible’.

With regard to giving and taking of money the mean is liberality, the excess and the defect prodigality and meanness. In these actions people exceed and fall short in contrary ways; the prodigal exceeds in spending and falls short in taking, while the mean man exceeds in taking and falls short in spending. (At present we are giving a mere outline or summary, and are satisfied with this; later these states will be more exactly determined.) With regard to money there are also other dispositions—a mean, magnificence (for the magnificent man differs from the liberal man; the former deals with large sums, the latter with small ones), and excess, tastelessness and vulgarity, and a deficiency, niggardliness; these differ from the states opposed to liberality, and the mode of their difference will be stated later.

With regard to honour and dishonour the mean is proper pride, the excess is known as a sort of ‘empty vanity’, and the deficiency is undue humility; and as we said liberalitas was related to magnificence, differing from it by dealing with small sums, so there is a state similarly related to proper pride, being concerned with small honours while that is concerned with great. For it is possible to desire honour as one ought, and more than one ought, and less, and the man who exceeds in his desires is called ambitious, the man who falls short unambitious, while the intermediate person has no
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name. the dispositions also are nameless, except that that of the ambitious man is called ambition. hence the people who are at the extremes lay claim to the middle place; and we ourselves sometimes call the intermediate person ambitious and sometimes unambitious, and sometimes praise the ambitious man and sometimes the unambitious. the reason of our doing this will be stated in what follows; but now let us speak of the remaining states according to the method which has been indicated.

with regard to anger also there is an excess, a deficiency, and a mean. although they can scarcely be said to have names, yet since we call the intermediate person good-tempered let us call the mean good temper; of the persons at the extremes let the one who exceeds be called irascible, and his vice irascibility, and the man who falls short an inirascible sort of person, and the deficiency inirascibility.

there are also three other means, which have a certain likeness to one another, but differ from one another: for they are all concerned with intercourse in words and actions, but differ in that one is concerned with truth in this sphere, the other two with pleasantness; and of this one kind is exhibited in giving amusement, the other in all the circumstances of life. we must therefore speak of these too, that we may the better see that in all things the mean is praiseworthy, and the extremes neither praiseworthy nor right, but worthy of blame. now most of these states also have no names, but we must try, as in the other cases, to invent names ourselves so that we may be clear and easy to follow. with regard to truth, then, the intermediate is a truthful sort of person and the mean may be called truthfulness, while the pretence which exaggerates is boastfulness and the person characterized by it a boaster, and that which underestates is mock modesty and the person characterized by it mock-modest. with regard to pleasantness in the giving of amusement the intermediate person is ready-witted and the disposition ready wit, the excess is buffoonery and the person characterized by it a buffoon, while the man who falls short is a sort of boor and his state is boorishness. with regard to the remaining kind of pleasantness, that which is exhibited in life in general, the man who is pleasant in the right way is friendly and the mean is friendliness, while the man who exceeds is an obsequious person if he has no end in view, a flatterer if he is aiming at his own advantage, and the man who falls short and is unpleasant in all circumstances is a quarrelsome and surly sort of person.

there are also means in the passions and concerned with the passions; since shame is not a virtue, and yet praise is extended to the modest man. for even in these matters one man is said to be intermediate, and another to exceed, as for instance the bashful man who is ashamed of everything; while he who falls short or is not ashamed of anything at all is shameless, and the intermediate person is modest. righteous indignation is a mean between envy and spite, and these states are concerned with the pain and pleasures that are felt at the fortunes of our neighbours; the man who is characterized by righteous indignation is pained at undeserved good fortune, the envious man, going beyond him, is pained at all good fortune, and the spiteful man falls so far short of being pained that he even rejoices. but these states there will be an opportunity of describing elsewhere; with regard to justice, since it has not one simple meaning, we shall, after describing the other states, distinguish its two kinds and say how each of them is a mean; and similarly we shall treat also of the rational virtues.

8 there are three kinds of disposition, then, two of them vices, involving excess and deficiency respectively, and one a virtue, viz. the mean, and all are in a sense opposed to all; for the extreme states are contrary both to the intermediate state and to each other, and the intermediate to the extremes; as the equal is greater relatively to the less, less relatively to the greater, so the middle states are excessive relatively to the deficiencies, deficient relatively to the excesses, both in passions and in actions. for the brave man appears rash relatively to the coward, and cowardly relatively to the rash man; and similarly the temperate man appears self-indulgent relatively to the insensible man, insensible relatively to the self-indulgent; and the liberal man prodigal relatively to the mean man, mean relatively to the prodigal. hence also the people at the extremes push the intermediate man each over to the other, and the brave man is called rash by the coward, cowardly by the rash man, and correspondingly in the other cases.

these states being thus opposed to one another, the greatest contrariety is that of the extremes to each other, rather than to the intermediate; for these are further from each other than from the intermediate, as the great is further from the small and the small from the great than both are from the equal. again, to the intermediate some extremes show a certain likeness, as that of rashness to courage and that of prodigality to liberality; but the extremes show the greatest unlikeness to each other; now contraries are defined as the things that are furthest from each other, so that things that are further apart are more contrary.

14 b 11–25, 1125 b 14–18.
15 the reference may be to the whole treatment of the moral virtues in iii. 6–iv. 9, or to the discussion of shame in iv. 9 and an intended corresponding discussion of righteous indignation, or to the discussion of these two states in rhet. ii. 6, 9, 10.
17 bk. vi.
To the mean in some cases the deficiency, in some the excess is more opposed; e.g. it is not rashness, which is an excess, but cowardice, which is a deficiency, that is more opposed to courage, and not insensibility, which is a deficiency, but self-indulgence, which is an excess, that is more opposed to temperance. This happens from two reasons, one being drawn from the thing itself; for because one extreme is nearer and liker to the intermediate, we oppose not this but rather its contrary to the intermediate. E.g., since rashness is thought liker and nearer to courage, and cowardice more unlike, we oppose rather the latter to courage; for things that are further from the intermediate are thought more contrary to it. This, then, is one cause, drawn from the thing itself; another is drawn from ourselves; for the things to which we ourselves more naturally tend seem more contrary to the intermediate. For instance, we ourselves tend more naturally to pleasures, and hence are more easily carried away towards self-indulgence than towards propriety. We describe as contrary to the mean, then, rather the directions in which we more often go to great lengths; and therefore self-indulgence, which is an excess, is the more contrary to temperance.

**Question:**

1. What are some difficulties in finding the mean between excess and deficiency?
3.3 Aristotle’s Will

The great fourth-century Athenian philosopher Aristotle left this will when he died in 322 B.C.E.


“All will be well; but, in case anything should happen, Aristotle has made these dispositions. Antipater is to be executor in all matters and in general; but, until Nicanor shall arrive, Aristomenes, Timarchus, Hipparchus, Dioteles and (if he consent and if circumstances permit him) Theophrastus shall take charge as well of Herpyllis and the children as of the property. And when the girl shall be grown up she shall be given in marriage to Nicanor; but if anything happen to the girl (which heaven forbid and no such thing will happen) before her marriage, or when she is married but before there are children, Nicanor shall have full powers, both with regard to the child and with regard to everything else, to administer in a manner worthy both of himself and of us. Nicanor shall take charge of the girl and of the boy Nicomachus as he shall think fit in all that concerns them as if he were father and brother. And if anything should happen to Nicanor (which heaven forbid!) either before he marries the girl, or when he has married her but before there are children, any arrangements that he may make shall be valid. And if Theophrastus is willing to live with her, <he shall have> the same rights as Nicanor. Otherwise the executors in consultation with Antipater shall administer as regards the daughter and the boy as seems to them to be best. The executors and Nicanor, in memory of me and of the steady affection which Herpyllis has borne towards me, shall take care of her in every other respect and, if she desires to be married, shall see that she be given to one not unworthy; and besides what she has already received they shall give her a talent of silver out of the estate and three handmaids whomsoever she shall choose besides the maid she has at present and the man-servant Pyrrhaeus; and if she chooses to remain at Chalcis, the lodge by the garden, if in Stagira, my father’s house. Whichever of these two houses she chooses, the executors shall furnish with such furniture as they think proper as and as Herpyllis herself may approve. Nicanor shall take charge of the boy Myrmex, that he be taken to his own friends in a manner worthy of me with the property of his which we received. Ambracis shall be given her freedom, and on my daughter’s marriage shall receive 500 drachmas and the maid whom she now has. And to Thale shall be given, in addition to the maid whom she has and who was bought, a thousand drachmas and a maid. And Simon, in addition to the money before paid to him towards another servant, shall either have a servant purchased for him or receive a further sum of money. And Tycho, Philo, Olympus and his child shall have their freedom when my daughter is married. None of the servants who waited upon me shall be sold but they shall continue to be employed; and when they arrive at the proper age they shall have their freedom if they deserve it. My executors shall see to it, when the images which Gryllion has been commissioned to execute are finished, that they be set up, namely that of Nicanor, that of Proxenus, which it was my intention to have executed, and that of Nicanor’s mother; also they shall set up the bust which has been executed of Arimnestus, to be a memorial of him seeing that he died childless, and shall dedicate my mother’s statue to Demeter at Nemea or wherever they think best. And wherever they bury me, there the bones of Pythias shall be laid, in accordance with her own instructions. And to commemorate Nicanor’s safe return, as I vowed on his behalf, they shall set up in Stagira stone statues of life size to Zeus and Athena the Saviours.”

Such is the tenor of Aristotle’s will. It is said that a very large number of dishes belonging to him were found, and that Lyco mentioned his bathing in a bath of warm oil and then selling the oil. Some relate that he placed a skin of warm oil on his stomach, and that, when he went to sleep, a bronze ball was placed in his hand with a vessel under it, in order that, when the ball dropped form his hand into the vessel, he might be waked up by the sound.

Questions:
1. What rights did husbands and fathers have over their families in Athens?
2. How does this document illustrate the lives of women and the institution of marriage in Athens?
3. What does this document reveal about the lives of servants or slaves in Athens?
3.4 Drama: *Antigone* by Sophocles

Antigone, written in the fifth century B.C.E. by Sophocles, deals with the children of Oedipus, the king who could not escape his fate. Antigone focuses on the meaning of honor and duty. Gender issues are also involved. Before the play begins, the sons of Oedipus, cursed by their father, have quarreled over royal power in Thebes. Eteocles drove his brother Polyneices from Thebes to the city-state of Argos where he married the daughter of the king. Polyneices then marched on Thebes to recover the throne. During the battle, the two brothers meet and kill each other. Their uncle, Creon, became king and immediately forbid the burial of Polyneices.


Scene: Before the palace of Creon, King of Thebes. . . .
Time: dawn of the day after the repulse of the Argive army from the assault of Thebes.

PROLOGUE

[ANTIGONE and ISMENE enter from the central door of the Palace.

ANTIG. Ismenê, dear sister,
You would think that we had already suffered enough
For the curse on Oedipus:
I cannot imagine any grief
That you and I have not gone through. And now-
Have they told you the new decree of our King Creon?

ISMENE I have heard nothing: I know
That two sisters lost two brothers, and double death
In a single hour; and I know that the Argive army
Fled in the night; but beyond this, nothing.

ANTIG. I thought so. And that is why I wanted you To come
out here with me. There is something we must do.

ISMENE Why do you speak so strangely?

ANTIG. Listen, Ismenê:
Creon buried our brother Eteoclês
With military honours, gave him a soldier’s funeral,
And it was right that he should; but Polyneicês,
Who fought as bravely and died as miserably,-
They say that Creon has sworn
No one shall bury him, no one mourn for him,
But his body must lie in the fields, a sweet treasure
For carrion birds to find as they search for food.
That is what they say, and our good Creon is
coming here
To announce it publicly; and the penalty-
Stoning to death in the public square!
There it is,
And now you can prove what you are:
A true sister, or a traitor to your family.

ISMENE Antigonê, you are mad! What could I possibly do?
ANTIG. You must decide whether you will help me or not.

ISMENE I do not understand you. Help you in what?

ANTIG. Ismenê, I am going to bury him. Will you come?

ISMENE Bury him! You have just said the new law forbids it.

ANTIG. He is my brother. And he is your brother, too.

ISMENE But think of the danger! Thank what Creon will do!

ANTIG. Creon is not strong enough to stand in my way.

ISMENE Ah sister!

Oedipus died, everyone hating him
For what his own search brought to light, his eyes
Ripped out by his own hand; and Iocastê died,
His mother and wife at once: she twisted the cords
That strangled her life; and our two brothers died,
Each killed by the other’s sword. And we are left:
But oh, Antigonê,
Think how much more terrible than these
Our own death would be if we should go against Creon
And do what he has forbidden! We are only women,
We cannot fight with men, Antigonê!
The law is strong, we must give in to the law
In this thing, and in worse. I beg the Dead
To forgive me, but I am helpless: I must yield
To those in authority. And I think it is dangerous business
To be always meddling.

ANTIG. If that is what you think,
I should not want you, even if you asked to come.
You have made your choice, you can be what you want to be.
But I will bury him; and if I must die,
I say that this crime is holy: I shall lie down
With him in death, and I shall be as dear
To him as he to me.
It is the dead,
Not the living, who make the longest demands:
We die for ever...
You may do as you like,
Since apparently the laws of the gods mean nothing to you.

ISMENE They mean a great deal to me; but I have no strength
To break laws that were made for the public good.

ANTIG. That must be your excuse, I suppose. But as for me,
I will bury the brother I love.

ISMENE Antigonê,
I am so afraid for you!
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ANTIG. You need not be:
You have yourself to consider, after all.

ISMENE But no one must hear of this, you must tell no one!
I will keep it a secret, I promise!

ANTIG. Oh tell it! Tell everyone!
Think how they’ll hate you when it all comes out
If they learn that you knew about it all the time!

ISMENE So fiery! You should be cold with fear.

ANTIG. Perhaps. But I am doing only what I must.

ISMENE But can you do it? I say that you cannot.

ANTIG. Very well: when my strength gives out, I shall do no more.

ISMENE Impossible things should not be tried at all.

ANTIG. Go away, Ismenê:
I shall be hating you soon, and the dead will too,
For your words are hateful. Leave me my foolish plan:
I am not afraid of the danger; if it means death,
It will not be the worst of deaths-death without honour.

ISMENE Go then, if you feel that you must.
You are unwise,
But a loyal friend indeed to those who love you.

[Exit into the Palace. ANTIGONE goes off, L.
Enters the Chorus.

SCENE I

CHORAG. But now at last our new King is coming:
Creon of Thebes, Menoeceus’ son.
In this auspicious dawn of his reign
What are the new complexities
That shifting Fate has woven for him?
What is his counsel? Why has he summoned
The old men to hear him?

[Enter Creon from the Palace. He addresses the
Chorus from the top step.

CREON Gentlemen: I have the honour to inform you that our
Ship of State, which recent storms have threatened
to destroy, has come safely to harbour at last,
guided by the merciful wisdom of Heaven. I have
summoned you here this morning because I know
that I can depend upon you: your devotion to King
Laïos was absolute; you never hesitated in your
duty to our late ruler Oedipus; and when Oedipus
died, your loyalty was transferred to his children.
Unfortunately, as you know, his two sons, the princes Eteocles and Polyneices, have killed each other in battle; and I, as the next in blood, have succeeded to the full power of the throne.

I am aware, of course, that no Ruler can expect complete loyalty from his subjects until he has been tested in office. Nevertheless, I say to you at the very outset that I have nothing but contempt for the kind of Governor who is afraid, for whatever reason, to follow the course that he knows is best for the State; and as for the man who sets private friendship above the public welfare, I have no use for him, either. I call God to witness that if I saw my country headed for ruin, I should not be afraid to speak out plainly; and I need hardly remind you that I would never have any dealings with any enemy of the people. No one values friendship more highly than I; but we must remember that friends made at the risk of wrecking our Ship are not real friends at all.

These are my principles, at any rate, and that is why I have made the following decision concerning the sons of Oedipus: Eteocles, who died as a man should die, fighting for his country, is to be buried with full military honours, with all the ceremony that is usual when the greatest heroes dies; but his brother Polyneices, who broke his exile to come back with fire and sword against his native city and the shrines of his father’s god, whose one idea was to spill the blood of his blood and sell his own people into slavery—Polyneices, I say, is to have no burial: no man is to touch him or say the least prayer for him; he shall lie on the plain, unburied; and the birds and the scavenging dogs can do with him whatever they like.

This is my command, and you can see the wisdom behind it. As long as I am king, no traitor is going to be honoured with the loyal man. But whoever shows by word and deed that he is on the side of the State, he shall have my respect while he is living, and my reverence when he is dead.

CHORAG. If that is your will, Creon son of Menoeceus,
You have the right to enforce it; we are yours.

CREON That is my will. Take care that you do your part.

CHORAG. We are old men: let the younger ones carry it out.

CREON I do not mean that: the sentries have been appointed.

CHORAG. Then what is it that you would have us do?

CREON You will give no support to whoever breaks the law.

CHORAG. Only a crazy man is in love with death!
CREON And death it is; yet money talks, and the wisest
Have sometimes been known to count a few coins too many.

A sentry discovers Antigone burying her brother’s body and brings
her to King Creon.

SCENE II

[Re-enter Sentry leading Antigone.

CHORAG. What does this mean? Surely this captive woman
Is the Princess, Antigonê. Why should she be taken?

SENTRY Here is the one who did it! We caught her
In the very act of burying him.-Where is Creon?

CHORAG. Just coming from the house. [Enter Creon, C.

CREON What has happened?
Why have you come back so soon?

***

SENTRY ... Here is this woman. She is the guilty one:
We found her trying to bury him.
Take her, then; question her; judge her as you will.
I am though with the whole thing now, and glad of it.

CREON But this is Antigonê! Why have you brought her here?

SENTRY She was burying him, I tell you! [Severely.

CREON Is this the truth?

SENTRY I saw her with my own eyes. Can I say more?

*** [Slowly, dangerously.

CREON And you, Antigonê,
You with your head hanging,-do you confess this thing?

ANTIG. I do. I deny nothing.
[To Sentry:

CREON You may go. [Exit Sentry.

[To Antigone:
Tell me, tell me briefly:
Had you heard my proclamation touching this matter?

ANTIG. It was public. Could I help hearing it?
CREON And yet you dared defy the law.

ANTIG. I dared.

It was not God’s proclamation. That final Justice
That rules the world below makes no such laws.
Your edict, King, was strong.
But all your strength is weakness itself against
The immortal unrecorded laws of God.
They are not merely now: they were, and shall be,
Operative for ever, beyond man utterly.
I knew I must die, even without your decree:
I am only mortal. And if I must die
Now, before it is my time to die,
Surely this is no hardship: can anyone
Living, as I live, with evil all about me,
Think Death less than a friend? This death of mine
Is of no importance; but if I had left my brother
Lying in death unburied, I should have suffered.
Now I do not.

You smile at me. Ah Creon,
Think me a fool, if you like; but it may well be
That a fool convicts me of folly.

CHORAG. Like father, like daughter: both headstrong, deaf to reason!
She has never learned to yield.

CREON She has much to learn.

The inflexible heart breaks first, the toughest iron
Cracks first, and the wildest horses bend their necks
At the pull of the smallest curb.

Pride? In a slave?
This girl is guilty of a double insolence,
Breaking the given laws and boasting of it.
Who is the man here,
She or I, if this crime goes unpunished?
Sister’s child, or more than sister’s child,
Or closer yet in blood—she and her sister
Win bitter death for this!

[To servants:
Go, some of you,
Arrest Ismenê. I accuse her equally.
Bring her: you will find her sniffling in the house there.
Her mind’s a traitor: crimes kept in the dark
Cry for light, and the guardian brain shudders;
But how much worse than this
Is brazen boasting of barefaced anarchy!

ANTIG. Creon, what more do you want than my death?

CREON Nothing.

That gives me everything.

ANTIG. Then I beg you: kill me.

This talking is a great weariness: your words
Are distasteful to me, and I am sure that mine
Seem so to you. And yet they should not seem so:
I should have praise and honour for what I have done.
All these men here would praise me
Were their lips not frozen shut with fear of you.

[Bitterly.

Ah the good fortune of kings,
Licensed to say and do whatever they please!

CREON You are alone here in that opinion.

ANTIG. No, they are with me. But they keep their tongues in leash.

CREON Maybe. But you are guilty, and they are not.

ANTIG. There is no guilt in reverence for the dead.

CREON But Eteoclês-was he not your brother too?

ANTIG. My brother too.

CREON And you insult his memory?

[Softly.

ANTIG. The dead man would not say that I insult it.

CREON He would: for you honour a traitor as much as him.

ANTIG. His own brother, traitor or not, and equal in blood.

CREON He made war on his country. Eteoclês defended it.

ANTIG. Nevertheless, there are honours due all the dead.

CREON But not the same for the wicked as for the just.

ANTIG. Ah Creon, Creon,
Which of us can say what the gods hold wicked?

CREON An enemy is an enemy, even dead.

ANTIG. It is my nature to join in love, not hate.

[Finally losing patience.

CREON Go join them, then; if you must have your love,
Find it in hell!

CHORAG. But see, Ismenê comes:

[Enter Ismene, guarded.

Those tears are sisterly, the cloud
That shadows her eyes rains down gentle sorrow.

CREON You too, Ismenê,
Snake in my ordered house, sucking my blood
Stealthily-and all the time I never knew
That these two sisters were aiming at my throne!

Ismenê,
Do you confess your share in this crime, or deny it?
Answer me.

ISMENE  Yes, if she will let my say so. I am guilty.  
[Coldly.

ANTIG.  No, Ismenê. You have no right to say so.
You would not help me, and I will not have you help me.

ISMENE  But now I know what you meant; and I am here
To join you, to take my share of punishment.

ANTIG.  The dead man and the gods who rule the dead
Know whose act this was. Words are not friends.

ISMENE  Do you refuse me, Antigonê? I want to die with you:
I too have a duty that I must discharge to the dead.

ANTIG.  You shall not lessen my death by sharing it.

ISMENE  What do I care for life when you are dead?

ANTIG.  Ask Creon. You’re always hanging on his opinions.

ISMENE  You are laughing at me. Why, Antigonê?

ANTIG.  It’s a joyless laughter, Ismenê.

ISMENE  But can I do nothing?

ANTIG.  Yes. Save yourself. I shall not envy you.
There are those who will praise you; I shall have honour, too.

ISMENE  But we are equally guilty!

ANTIG.  No, more, Ismenê.
You are alive, but I belong to Death.

CREON  [To the Chorus:
Gentlemen, I beg you to observe these girls:
One has just now lost her mind; the other
It seems, has never had a mind at all.

ISMENE  Grief teaches the steadiest minds to waver, King.

CREON  Yours certainly did, when you assumed guilt with the guilty!

ISMENE  But how could I go on living without her?

CREON  You are.
She is already dead.

ISMENE  But your own son’s bride!
CREON  There are places enough for him to push his plow.
       I want no wicked women for my sons!

ISMENE  O dearest Haimon, how your father wrongs you!

CREON  I've had enough of your childish talk of marriage!

CHORAG. Do you really intend to steal this girl from your son?

CREON  No; Death will do that for me.

CHORAG. Then she must die?

CREON  You dazzle me.

—But enough of this talk!

[To Guards:

You, there, take them away and guard them well:
For they are but women, and even brave men run
When they see Death coming.

[Exeunt Ismene, Antigone, and Guards.

Questions:
1. Why is Antigone willing to defy the king’s decree and give her brother burial?
2. What arguments to Ismene and Creon use to oppose her action?
3. What can you conclude about the way men and women were regarded in this society?
3.5 Pericles’ Funeral Oration by Thucydides

Pericles (c. 495 - 429 B.C.E.) was an Athenian statesman. Included in Thucydides’ (460-400 B.C.E.) History of the Peloponnesian War, his funeral oration is a classic statement of Athenian values. In it, he reminds his countrymen of the deeds of the honored dead, the values for which they died, and the unique qualities of Athenian society.


In the same winter the Athenians, following their annual custom, gave a public funeral for those who had been the first to die in the war. These funerals are held in the following way: two days before the ceremony the bones of the fallen are brought and put in a tent which has been erected, and people make whatever offerings they wish to their own dead. Then there is a funeral procession in which coffins of cypress wood are carried on wagons. There is one coffin for each tribe, which contains the bones of members of that tribe. One empty bier is decorated and carried in the procession: that is for the missing, whose bodies could not be recovered. Everyone who wishes to, both citizens and foreigners, can join in the procession, and the women who are related to the dead are there to make their laments at the tomb. The bones are laid in the public burial-place, which is in the most beautiful quarter outside the city walls. Here the Athenians always bury those who have fallen in war. The only exception is those who died at Marathon, who, because their achievement was considered absolutely outstanding, were buried on the battlefield itself.

When the bones have been laid in the earth, a man chosen by the city for his intellectual gifts and for his general reputation makes an appropriate speech in praise of the dead, and after the speech all depart. This is the procedure at these burials, and all through the war, when the time came to do so, the Athenians followed this ancient custom. Now, at the burial of those who were the first to fall in the war Pericles, the son of Xanthippus, was chosen to make the speech. When the moment arrived, he came forward from the tomb and, standing on a high platform, so that he might be heard by as many people as possible in the crowd, he spoke as follows:

‘Many of those who have spoken here in the past have praised the institution of this speech at the close of our ceremony. It seemed to them a mark of honour to our soldiers who have fallen in war that a speech should be made over them. I do not agree. These men have shown themselves valiant in action, and it would be enough, I think, for their glories to be proclaimed in action, as you have just seen it done at this funeral organized by the state. Our belief in the courage and manliness of so many should not be hazard on the goodness or badness of one man’s speech. Then it is not easy to speak with a proper sense of balance, when a man’s listeners find it difficult to believe in the truth of what one is saying. The man who knows the facts and loves the dead may well think that an oration tells less than what he knows and what he would like to hear: others who do not know so much may feel envy for the dead, and think the orator over-praises them, when he speaks of exploits that are beyond their own capacities. Praise of other people is tolerable only up to a certain point, the point where one still believes that one could do oneself some of the things one is hearing about. Once you get beyond this point, you will find people becoming jealous and incredulous. However, the fact is that this institution was set up and approved by our forefathers, and it is my duty to follow the tradition and do my best to meet the wishes and the expectations of every one of you.

‘I shall begin by speaking about our ancestors, since it is only right and proper on such an occasion to pay them the honour of recalling what they did. In this land of ours there have always been the same people living from generation to generation up till now, and they, by their courage and their virtues, have handed it on to us, a free country. They certainly deserve our praise. Even more so do our fathers deserve it. For to the inheritance they had received they added all the empire we have now, and it was not without blood and toil that they handed it down to us of the present generation. And then we ourselves, assembled here today, who are mostly in the prime of life, have, in most directions, added to the power of our empire and have organized our State in such a way that it is perfectly well able to look after itself both in peace and in war.

‘I have no wish to make a long speech on subjects familiar to you all: so I shall say nothing about the warlike deeds by which we acquired our power or the battles in which we or our fathers gallantly resisted our enemies, Greek or foreign. What I want to do is, in the first place, to discuss the spirit in which we faced our trials and also our constitution and the way of life which has made us great. After that I shall speak in praise of the dead, believing that this kind of speech is not inappropriate to the present occasion, and that this whole assembly, of citizens and foreigners, may listen to it with advantage.

‘Let me say that our system of government does not copy the institutions of our neighbours. It is me the case of our being a model to others, than of our imitating anyone else. Our constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people. When it is a question of settling private disputes, everyone is equal
before the law; when it is a question of putting one person before another in positions of public responsibility, what counts is not membership of a particular class, but the actual ability which the man possesses. No one, so long as he has it in him to be of service to the state, is kept in political obscurity because of poverty. And, just as our political life is free and open, so is our day-to-day life in our relations with each other. We do not get into a state with our next-door neighbour if he enjoys himself in his own way, nor do we give him the kind of black looks which, though they do no real harm, still do hurt people’s feelings. We are free and tolerant in our private lives; but in public affairs we keep to the law. This is because it commands our deep respect.

‘We give our obedience to those whom we put in positions of authority, and we obey the laws themselves, especially those which are for the protection of the oppressed, and those unwritten laws which it is an acknowledged shame to break.

‘And here is another point. When our work is over, we are in a position to enjoy all kinds of recreation for our spirits. There are various kinds of contests and sacrifices regularly throughout the year; in our own homes we find a beauty and a good taste which delight us every day and which drive away our cares. Then the greatness of our city brings it about that all the good things from all over the world flow in to us, so that to us it seems just as natural to enjoy foreign goods as our own local products.

‘Then there is a great difference between us and our opponents, in our attitude towards military security. Here are some examples: Our city is open to the world, and we have no periodical deportations in order to prevent people observing or finding out secrets which might be of military advantage to the enemy. This is because we rely, not on secret weapons, but on our own real courage and loyalty. There is a difference, too, in our educational systems. The Spartans, from their earliest boyhood, are submitted to the most laborious training in courage; we pass our lives without all these restrictions, and yet are just as ready to face the same dangers as they are. Here is a proof of this: When the Spartan’s invade our land, they do not come by themselves, but bring all their allies with them; whereas we, when we launch an attack abroad, do the job by ourselves, and, though fighting on foreign soil, do not often fail to defeat opponents who are fighting for their own hearths and homes. As a matter of fact none of our enemies have ever yet been confronted with our total strength, because we have to divide our attention between our navy and the many missions on which our troops are sent on land. Yet, if our enemies engage a detachment of our forces and defeat it, they give themselves credit for having thrown back our entire army; or, if they lose, they claim that they were beaten by us in full strength. There are certain advantages, I think, in our way of meeting danger voluntarily, with an easy mind, instead of with a laborious training, with natural rather than with state-induced courage. We do not have to spend our time practising to meet sufferings which are still in the future; and when they are actually upon us we show ourselves just as brave as these others who are always in strict training. This is one point in which, I think, our city deserves to be admired. There are also others:

‘Our love of what is beautiful does not lead to extravagance; our love of the things of the mind does not make us soft. We regard wealth as something to be properly used, rather than as something to boast about. As for poverty, no one need be ashamed to admit it: the real shame is in not taking practical measures to escape from it. Here each individual is interested not only in his own affairs but in the affairs of the state as well: even those who are mostly occupied with their own business are extremely well-informed on general politics—This is a peculiarity of ours: we do not say that a man who takes no interest in politics is a man who minds his own business; we say that he has no business here at all. We Athenians, in our own persons, take our decisions on policy or submit them to proper discussions: for we do not think that there is an incompatibility between words and deeds; the worst thing is to rush into action before the consequences have been properly debated. And this is another point where we differ from other people. We are capable at the same time of taking risks and of estimating them beforehand. Others are brave out of ignorance; and, when they stop to think, they begin to fear. But the man who can most truly be accounted brave is he who best knows the meaning of what is sweet in life and of what is terrible, and then goes out undeterred to meet what is to come.

‘Again, in questions of general good feeling there is a great contrast between us and most other people. We make friends by doing good to others, not by receiving good from them. This makes our friendship all the more reliable, since we want to keep alive the feelings of those who are in our debt by showing continued good-will to them: whereas the feelings of one who owes us something lack the enthusiasm, since he knows that, when he repays our kindness, it will be more like paying back a debt than giving something spontaneously. We are unique in this. When we do kindnesses to others, we do not do them out of any calculations of profit or loss: we do them without afterthought, relying on our free liberality. Taking everything together then, I declare that our city is an education to Greece, and I declare that in my opinion each single one of our citizens, in all the manifold aspects of life, is able to show himself the rightful lord and owner of his own person, and do this, moreover, with exceptional grace and exceptional versatility. And to show that this is no empty boasting for the present occasion, but real tangible fact, you have only to consider the power which our city possesses and which has been won by those very qualities which I have mentioned. Athens, alone of the states we know, comes to her testing time in a greatness that surpasses what was imagined of her. In her case, and in her case alone, no invading enemy is ashamed at being defeated, and no subject can complain of being governed by people unfit for their responsibilities.
Mighty indeed are the marks and monuments of our empire which we have left. Future ages will wonder at us, as the present age wonders at us now. We do not need the praises of a Homer, or of anyone else whose words may delight us for the moment, but whose estimation of facts will fall short of what is really true. For our adventurous spirit has forced an entry into every sea and into every land; and everywhere we have left behind us everlasting memorials of good done to our friends or suffering inflict on our enemies.

This, then, is the kind of city for which these men, who could not bear the thought of losing her, nobly fought and nobly died. It is only natural that every one of us who survive them should be willing to undergo hardships in her service. And it was for this reason that I have spoken at such length about our city, because I wanted to make it clear that for us there is more at stake than there is for others who lack our advantages; also I wanted my words of praise for the dead to be set in the bright light of evidence. And now the most important of these words has been spoken. I have sung the praises of our city; but it was the courage and gallantry of these men, and of people like them, which made her splendid. Nor would you find it true in the case of many of the Greeks, as it is true of them, that no words can do more than justice to their deeds.

To me it seems that the consummation which has overtaken these men show us the meaning of manliness in its first revelation and in its final proof. Some of them, no doubt, had their faults; but what we ought to remember first is their gallant conduct against the enemy in defence of their native land. They have blotted out evil with good, and done more service to the commonwealth than they ever did harm in their private lives. No one of these men weakened because he wanted to go on enjoying his wealth: no one put off the awful day in the hope that he might live to escape his poverty and grow rich. More to be desired than such things, they chose to check the enemy’s pride. This, to them, was a risk most glorious, and they accepted it, willing to strike down the enemy and relinquish everything else. As for success or failure, they left that in the doubtful hands of Hope, and when the reality of battle was before their faces, they put their trust in their own selves. In the fighting, they thought it more honourable to stand their ground and suffer death than to give in and save their lives. So they fled from the reproaches of men, abiding with life and limb the brunt of battle; and, in a small moment of time, the climax of their lives, a culmination of glory, not of fear, were swept away from us.

So and such they were, these men—worthy of their city. We who remain behind may hope to be spared their fate, but must resolve to keep the same daring spirit against the foe. It is not simply a question of estimating the advantages in theory. I could tell you a long story (and you know it as well as I do) about what is to be gained by beating the enemy back. What I would prefer is that you should fix your eyes every day on the greatness of Athens as she really is, and should fall in love with her. When you realize her greatness, then reflect that what made her great was men with a spirit of adventure, men who knew their duty, men who were ashamed to fall below a certain standard. If they ever failed in an enterprise, they made up their minds that at any rate the city should not find their courage lacking to her, and they gave to her the best contribution that they could. They gave her their lives, to her and to all of us, and for their own selves they won praises that never grow old, the most splendid of sepulchres—not the sepulchre in which their bodies are laid, but where their glory remains eternal in men’s minds, always there on the right occasion to stir others to speech or to action. For famous men have the whole earth as their memorial: it is not only the inscriptions on their graves in their own country that mark them out; no, in foreign lands also, not in any visible form but in people’s hearts, their memory abides and grows. It is for you to try to be like them. Make up your minds that happiness depends on being free, and freedom depends on being courageous. Let there be no relaxation in face of the perils of the war. The people who have most excuse for despising death are not the wretched and unfortunate, who have no hope of doing well for themselves, but those who run the risk of a complete reversal in their lives, and who would feel the difference most intensely, if things went wrong for them. Any intelligent man would find a humiliation caused by his own slackness more painful to bear than death, when death comes to him unperceived, in battle, and in the confidence of his patriotism.

For these reasons I shall not commiserate with those parents of the dead, who are present here. Instead I shall try to comfort them. They are well aware that they have grown up in a world where there are many changes and chances. But this is good fortune—for men to end their lives with honour, as these have done, and for you honourable to lament them: their life was set to a measure where death and happiness went hand in hand. I know that it is difficult to convince you of this. When you see other people happy you will often be reminded of what used to make you happy too. One does not feel sad at not having some good thing which is outside one’s experience: real grief is felt at the loss of something which one used to. All the same, those of you who are of the right age must bear up and take comfort in the thought of having more to their deeds.
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‘As for those of you here who are sons or brothers of the dead, I can see a hard struggle in front of you. Everyone always speaks well of the dead, and, even if you rise to the greatest heights of heroism, it will be a hard thing for you to get the reputation of having come near, let alone equalled, their standard. When one is alive, one is always liable to the jealousy of one’s competitors, but when one is out of the way, the honour one receives is sincere and unchallenged.

‘Perhaps I should say a word or two on the duties of women to those among you who are now widowed. I can say all I have to say in a short word of advice. Your great glory is not to be inferior to what God has made you, and the greatest glory of a woman is to be least talked about by men, whether they are praising you or criticizing you. I have now, as the law demanded, said what I had to say. For the time being our offerings to the dead have been made, and for the future their children will be supported at the public expense by the city, until they come of age. This is the crown and prize which she offers, both to the dead and to their children, for the ordeals which they have faced. Where the rewards of valour are the greatest, there you will find also the best and bravest spirits among the people. And now, when you have mourned for your dear ones, you must depart.’

Questions:
1. What are the main virtues of Athens as described by Pericles?
2. What is his purpose in stating them?
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3.6 On the Murder of Eratosthenes: A Husband’s Defense

This is a transcript of a trial before the citizen’s assembly at Athens around 400 B.C.E. Euphiletus defends himself on a charge of murdering Eratosthenes, his wife’s lover.


... When I, Athenians, decided to marry, and brought a wife into my house, for some time I was disposed neither to vex her nor to leave her too free to do just as she pleased; I kept a watch on her as far as possible, with such observation of her as was reasonable. But when a child was born to me, thence-forward I began to trust her, and placed all my affairs in her hands, presuming that we were now in perfect intimacy. It is true that in the early days, Athenians, she was the most excellent of wives; she was a clever, frugal housekeeper, and kept everything in the nicest order. But as soon as I lost my mother, her death became the cause of all my troubles. For it was in attending her funeral that my wife was seen by this man [Eratosthenes], who in time corrupted her. He looked out for the servant-girl who went to market, and so paid addresses to her mistress by which he wrought her ruin.

Now in the first place I must tell you, sirs (for I am obliged to give you these particulars), my dwelling is on two floors, the upper being equal in space to the lower, with the women’s quarters above and the men’s below. When the child was born to us, its mother suckled it; and in order that, each time that it had to be washed, she might avoid the risk of descending by the stairs, I used to live above, and the women below. By this time it had become such an habitual thing that my wife would often leave me and go down to sleep with the child, so as to be able to give it the breast and stop its crying. Things went on in this way for a long time, and I never suspected, but was simpleminded enough to suppose that my own was the chastest wife in the city.

Time went on, sirs; I came home unexpectedly from the country, and after dinner the child started crying in a peevish way, as the servant-girl was annoying it on purpose to make it so behave; for the man was in the house,-I learnt it all later. So I bade my wife go and give the child her breast, to stop its howling. At first she refused, as though delighted to see me home again after so long; but when I began to be angry and bade her go,

“Yes, so that you,” she said, “may have a try here at the little maid. Once before, too, when you were drunk, you pulled her about.” At that I laughed, while she got up, went out of the room, and closed the door, feigning to make fun, and she turned the key in the lock. I, without giving a thought to the matter, or having any suspicion, went to sleep in all content after my return from the country.

Towards daytime she came and opened the door. I asked why the doors made a noise in the night; she told me that the child’s lamp had gone out, and she had lit it again at our neighbour’s. I was silent and believed it was so. But it struck me, sirs, that she had powdered her face, though her brother had died not thirty days before; even so, however, I made no remark on the fact, but left the house in silence.

After this, sirs, an interval occurred in which I was left quite unaware of my own injuries; I was then accosted by a certain old female, who was secretly sent by a woman with whom that man was having an intrigue, as I heard later. This woman was angry with him and felt herself wronged, because he no longer visited her so regularly, and she kept a close watch on him until she discovered what was the cause. So the old creature accosted me where she was on the look-out, near my house, and said, “Euphiletus, do not think it is from any meddlesomeness that I have approached you; for the man who is working both your and your wife’s dishonour happens to be our enemy. If, therefore, you take the servant-girl who goes to market and waits on you, and torture her, you will learn all. It is,” she said, “Eratosthenes of Oë who is doing this; he has debauched not only your wife, but many others besides; he makes an art of it.”
With these words, sirs, she took herself off; I was at once perturbed; all that had happened came into my mind, and I was filled with suspicion—reflecting first how I was shut up in my chamber, and then remembering how on that night the inner and outer doors made a noise, which had never occurred before, and how it struck me that my wife had put on powder. All these things came into my mind, and I was filled with suspicion. Returning home, I bade the servant-girl follow me to the market, and taking her to the house of an intimate friend, I told her I was fully informed of what was going on in my house.

“So it is open to you,” I said, “to choose as you please between two things,—either to be whipped and thrown into a mill, never to have any rest from miseries of that sort, or else to speak out the whole truth and, instead of suffering any harm, obtain my pardon for your transgressions. Tell no lies, but speak the whole truth.”

The girl at first denied it, and bade me do what I pleased, for she knew nothing; but when I mentioned Eratosthenes to her, and said that he was the man who visited my wife, she was dismayed, supposing that I had exact knowledge of everything. At once she threw herself down at my knees, and having got my pledge that she should suffer no harm, she accused him, first, of approaching her after the funeral, and then told how at last she became his messenger; how my wife in time was persuaded, and by what means she procured his entrances, and how at the Thesmophoria, while I was in the country, she went off to the temple with his mother. And the girl gave an exact account of everything else that had occurred.

When her tale was all told, I said, “Well now, see that nobody in the world gets knowledge of this; otherwise, nothing in your arrangement with me will hold good. And I require that you show me their guilt in the very act; I want no words, but manifestation of the fact, if it really is so.”

She agreed to do this. Then came an interval of four or five days... 2. But first I wish to relate what took place on the last day. I had an intimate friend named Sostratus. After sunset I met him as he came from the country. As I knew that, arriving at that hour, he would find none of his circle at home, I invited him to dine with me; we came to my house, mounted to the upper room, and had dinner. When he had made a good meal, he left me and departed; then I went to bed. Eratosthenes, sirs, entered, and the maidservant roused me at once, and told me that he was in the house. Bidding her look after the door, I descended and went out in silence; I called on one friend and another, and found some of them at home, while others were out of town. I took with me as many as I could among those who were there, and so came along. Then we got torches from the nearest shop, and went in; the door was open, as the girl had it in readiness.

We pushed open the door of the bedroom, and the first of us to enter were in time to see him lying down by my wife; those who followed saw him standing naked on the bed. I gave him a blow, sirs, which knocked him down, and pulling round his two hands behind his back, and tying them, I asked him why he had the insolence to enter my house. He admitted his guilt; then he besought and implored me not to kill him, but to exact a sum of money.

To this I replied, “It is not I who am going to kill you, but our city’s law, which you have transgressed and regarded as of less account than your pleasures, choosing rather to commit this foul offence against my wife and my children than to obey the laws like a decent person.”

Thus it was, sirs, that this man incurred the fate that the laws ordain for those who do such things; he had not been dragged in there from the street, nor had he taken refuge at my hearth, as these people say. 3 For how could it be so, when it was in the bedroom that he was struck and fell down then and there, and I pinioned his arms, and so many persons were in the house that he could not escape them, as he had neither steel nor wood nor anything else with which he might have beaten off those who had entered? But, sirs, I think you know as well as I that those whose acts are against justice do not acknowledge that their enemies speak the truth, but lie themselves and use other such devices to foment anger in their hearers against those whose acts are just. So, first read the law.

---

1 A festival in honour of Demeter, celebrated by Athenian matrons in October
2 Some words are missing here in the text.
3 Witnesses for the prosecution. To kill someone on the hearth, the center of the family religion, would be sacrilege.
He did not dispute it, sirs: he acknowledged his guilt, and besought and implored that he might not be killed, and was ready to pay compensation in money. But I would not agree to his estimate, as I held that our city’s law should have higher authority; and I obtained that satisfaction which you deemed most just when you imposed it on those who adopt such courses. Now, let my witnesses come forward in support of these statements.

[Witnesses are called and heard supporting his statements.]

I therefore, sirs, do not regard this requital as having been exacted in my own private interest, but in that of the whole city. For those who behave in that way, when they see the sort of prizes offered for such transgressions, will be less inclined to trespass against their neighbours, if they see that you also take the same view. Otherwise it were better far to erase our established laws, and ordain others which will inflict the penalties on men who keep watch on their own wives, and will allow full immunity to those who would debauch them. This would be a far juster way than to let the citizens be entrapped by the laws; these may bid a man, on catching an adulterer, to deal with him in whatever way he pleases, but the trials are found to be more dangerous to the wronged parties than to those who, in defiance of the laws, dishonour the wives of others. For I am now risking the loss of life, property and all else that I have, because I obeyed the city’s laws.

Questions:
1. What rights did husbands and fathers have over their families in Athens?
2. How does this document illustrate the lives of women and the institution of marriage in Athens?
3. What does this document reveal about the lives of servants or slaves in Athens?
4.1 The Speech of Camillus: “All Things Went Well When We Obeyed the Gods, but Badly When We Disobeyed Them”

Marcus Furius Camillus (d. c. 365 B.C.E.) was a patrician whose success as a general led to his election as dictator. Perhaps his greatest victory was his conquest of the Etruscan city of Veii. In the speech included here, attributed to Camillus by the Roman historian Titus Livius, he argues against the colonization of the captured city.

"When you see such striking stances of the effects of honoring or neglecting the divine, do you not see what an act of impiety you are about to perpetrate, and indeed, just at the moment we are emerging from the shipwreck brought about by our former irreligiosity? We have a city founded with all due observance of the auspices and augury. Not a spot in it is without religious rites and gods. Not only are the days for our sacrifices fixed, but also the places where they are to be performed.

"Romans, would you desert all these gods, public as well as private? Contrast this proposal with the action that occurred during the siege and was beheld with no less admiration by the enemy than by yourselves? This was the deed performed by Gaius Fabius, who descended from the citadel, braved Gallic spear, and performed on the Quirinal Hill the solemn rites of the Fabian family. Is it your wish that the family religious rites should not be interrupted even during war but that the public rites and the gods of Rome should be deserted in time of peace? Do you want the Pontiffs and Flamens to be more negligent of public ritual than a private individual in the anniversary rite of a particular family?

"Perhaps someone may say that either we will perform these duties at Veii or we will send our priests from there to perform the rituals here—but neither can be done without infringing on the established forms of worship. For not to enumerate all the sacred rites individually and all the gods, is it possible at the banquet of Jupiter for the lectisternium [see pp. 196–97, "Steadiness of the Romans"] to be set up anywhere else other than the Capitol? What shall I say of the eternal fire of Vesta, and of the statue which, as the pledge of empire, is kept under the safeguard of the temple [the statue of Athena, the Palladium, supposed to have been brought by Aeneas from Troy]? What, O Mars Gradivus, and you, Father Quirinus—what of your sacred shields? Is it right that these holy things, some as old as the city itself, some of them even more ancient, be abandoned on unconsecrated ground?

"Observe the difference existing between us and our ancestors. They handed down to us certain sacred rites to be performed by us on the Alban Mount and at Lavinium. It was felt to be impious to transfer these rites from enemy towns to Rome—yet you think you can transfer them to Veii, an enemy city, without sin! . . .

"We talk of sacred rituals and temples—but what about priests? Does it not occur to you what a sacrilege you are proposing to commit in respect of them? The Vestals have but one dwelling place which nothing ever caused them to leave except the capture of the city. Shall your Virgins forsake you, O Vesta? And shall the Flamen by living abroad draw on himself and on his country such a weight of guilt every night [the Flamen was supposed to never leave Rome]? What of the other things, all of which we transact under auspices within the Pomerium [the sacred boundary around Rome]? To what oblivion, to what neglect do we consign them? The Curiate Assembly, which deals with questions of war; the Centuriate Assembly at which you elect consuls and military tribunes—when can they be held under auspices except where they are accustomed to be held? Shall we transfer them to Veii? Or shall the people, for the sake of the assemblies, come together at great inconvenience in this city, deserted by gods and men? . . .
“Not without good cause did gods and men select this place for the founding of a city. These most healthful hills, a convenient river by means of which the produce of the soil may be conveyed from the inland areas, by which supplies from overseas may be obtained, close enough to the sea for all purposes of convenience, yet not exposed by being too close to the danger of foreign fleets. Situated in the center of Italy, it is singularly adapted by nature for the growth of a city. The very size of so new a city is itself proof. Citizens, it is now in its three hundred and sixty fifth year. Throughout those years you have been at war with many ancient nations. Not to mention single states, neither the Volscians combined with the Aequi, together with all their powerful towns, not all Etruria, so powerful by land and sea, occupying the breadth of Italy between the Tyrrhenian and Adriatic seas, have been a match for you in war. Since this is so, why in the name of goodness do you want to experiment elsewhere when you had such good fortune here? Though your courage may go with you, the fortune of this place certainly cannot be transferred. here is the Capitol, where a Human head was found which foretold that in that place would be the head of the world, the chief seat of empire [a play on words; head in Latin is caput]. Here, when the Capitol was being cleared with augural rites, the gods Juventas and Terminus, to the great joy of your fathers, refused to be moved. here is the fire of Vesta, here the sacred shields of Mars which fell from heaven. Here the gods will be propitious to you—if you stay.”

Question:
1. What are the similarities between this speech and Pericles’ Funeral Oration?
4.2 Women in Roman Politics: Manipulators or Manipulated?

Cleopatra (d. 31 B.C.E.), the most famous woman in Roman politics, was not even Roman, but was the last Ptolemy to rule Egypt. Some historians have argued that the liaison between Cleopatra and Antony was purely for political advantage, but contemporaries and ancient historians did not. Antony's passion for Cleopatra was obvious to them. Although Roman women did not have an official role in public life, they were often used as the cement in political alliances, such as when Antony married Octavia, the sister of Caesar [Octavian, later known as Augustus].


Antony first entertained Caesar, this also being a concession on Caesar’s part to his sister; and when at length an agreement was made between them, that Caesar should give Antony two of his legions to serve him in the Parthian war, and that Antony should in return leave with him a hundred armed galleys, Octavia further obtained of her husband, besides this, twenty light ships for her brother, and of her brother, a thousand foot for her husband. So, having parted good friends, Caesar went immediately to make war with Pompey to conquer Sicily. And Antony, leaving in Caesar’s charge his wife and children, and his children by his former wife Fulvia set sail for Asia.

But the mischief that thus long had lain still, the passion for Cleopatra, which better thoughts had seemed to have lulled and charmed into oblivion, upon his approach to Syria, gathered strength again, and broke out into a flame. And, in fine, like Plato’s restive and rebellious horse of the human soul, flinging off all good and wholesome counsel, and breaking fairly loose, he sends Fonteius Capito to bring Cleopatra into Syria. To whom at her arrival he made no small or trifling present, Phoenicia, Coele-Syria, Cyprus, great part of Cilicia, that side of Judaea which produces balm, that part of Arabia where the Nabathaeans extend to the outer sea; profuse gifts, which much displeased the Romans.

... But Octavia, in Rome, being desirous to Antony, asked Caesar’s leave to go to him; which he gave her, not so much, say most authors, to gratify his sister, as to obtain a fair pretence to begin the war upon her dishonorable reception. She no sooner arrived at Athens, but by letters from Antony she was informed of his new expedition, and his will that she should await him there. And, though she were much displeased, not being ignorant of the real reason of this usage, yet she wrote to him to know of what place he would be pleased she should send the things she had brought with her for his use; for she had brought clothes for his soldiers, baggage, cattle, money, and presents for his friends and officers, and two thousand chosen soldiers sumptuously armed, to form praetorian cohorts. This message was brought from Octavia to Antony by Niger, one of his friends, who added to it the praises she deserved so well. Cleopatra, feeling her rival already, as it were, at hand, was seized with fear, lest if to her noble life and her high alliance, she once could add the charm of daily habit and affectionate intercourse, she should become irresistible, and be his absolute mistress for ever. So she feigned to be dying for love of Antony, bring her body down by slender diet; when he entered the room, she fixed her eyes upon him in a rapture, and when he left, seemed to languish and half faint away. She took great pains that he should see her in tears, and, as soon as he noticed it, hastily dried them up and turned away, as if it were her wish that he should know nothing of it. All this was acting while he prepared for Media; and Cleopatra’s creatures were not slow to forward the design, upbraiding Antony with his unfeeling, hard-hearted temper, thus letting a woman perish whose soul depended upon him and him alone. Octavia, it was true, was his wife, and had been married to him because it was found convenient for the affairs of her brother that it should be so, and she had the honor of the title; but Cleopatra, the sovereign queen of many nations, had been contented with the name of his mistress, nor did she shun or despise the character whilst she might see him, might live with him, and enjoy him; if she were bereaved of this, she would not survive the loss. In fine, they so melted and unmanned him, that, fully believing she would die if he forsook her, he put off the war and returned to Alexandria, deferring his Median expedition until next summer, though news came of the Parthians being all in confusion with intestine disputes. Nevertheless, he did some time after go into that country, and made an alliance with the king of Media, by marriage of a son of his by Cleopatra to the king’s daughter, who was yet very young; and so returned, with his thoughts taken up about the civil war.

When Octavia returned from Athens, Caesar, who considered she had been injuriously treated, commanded her to live in a separate house; but she refused to leave the house of her husband, and entreated him, unless he had already resolved, upon other motives, to make war with Antony, that he would on her account let it alone; it would be intolerable to have it said of the two greatest commanders in the world, that they had involved the Roman people in a civil war, the one out of passion for the other out of resentment about a woman. And her behavior proved her words to be sincere. She remained in Antony’s house as if he were at home in it, and took the noblest and most generous care, not only of his children by her, but of those by Fulvia also. She received all the friends of Antony that came to Rome to seek office or upon any business, and did her utmost to prefer their requests to Caesar; yet this her honorable deportment did but, without her
meaning it, damage the reputation of Antony; the wrong he did to such a woman made him hated. Nor was the division he made among his sons at Alexandria less unpopular; it seemed a theatrical piece of insolence and contempt of his country. For, assembling the people in the exercise ground, and causing two golden thrones to be placed on a platform of silver, the one for him and the other for Cleopatra, and at their feet lower thrones for their children, he proclaimed Cleopatra queen of Egypt, Cyrus, Libya, and Cœle-Syria, and with her conjointly Caesarion, the reupted son of the former Caesar, who left Cleopatra with child. His own sons by Cleopatra were to have the style of kings of kings; to Alexander he gave Armenia and Media, with Parthia, so soon as it should be overcome; to Ptolemy, Phoenicia, Syria, and Cilicia. Alexander was brought out before the people in the Median costume, the tiara and upright peak, and Ptolemy, in boots and mantle and Macedonian cap done about with the diadem; for this was the habit of the successors of Alexander, as the other was of the Medes and Armenians. And, as soon as they had saluted their parents, the one was received by a guard of Macedonians, the other by one of Armenians. Cleopatra was then, as at other times when she appeared in public, dressed in the habit of the goddess Isis, and gave audience to the people under the name of the New Isis.

Caesar, relating these things in the senate, and often complaining to the people, excited men’s minds against Antony. And Antony also sent messages of accusation against Caesar. The principal of his charges were these: first, that he had not made any division with him of Sicily, which was lately taken from Pompey; secondly, that he had retained the ships he had lent him for the war; thirdly, that after deposing Lepidus, their colleague, he had taken for himself the army, governments, and revenues formerly appropriated to him; and, lastly, that he had parcelled out almost all Italy amongst his own soldiers, and left nothing for his. Caesar’s answer was as follows: that he had put Lepidus out of government because of his own misconduct; that what he had got in war he would divide with Antony, so soon as Antony gave him a share of Armenia; that Antony’s soldiers had no claims in Italy, being in possession of Media and Parthia, the acquisitions which their brave actions under their general had added to the Roman empire.

Antony was in Armenia when this answer came to him, and immediately sent Canidius with sixteen legions towards the sea; but he, in the company of Cleopatra, went to Ephesus, whither ships were coming in from all quarters to form the navy, consisting, vessels of which Cleopatra furnished two hundred, together with twenty thousand talents, and provision for the whole army during the war. Antony, on the advice of Domitius and some others, bade Cleopatra return into Egypt, there to expect the event of the war; but she, dreading some new reconciliation by Octavia’s means, prevailed with Canidius, by a large sum of money, to speak in her favor with Antony, pointing out to him that it was not just that one that bore so great a part in the charge of the war should be robbed of her share of glory in the carrying it on; nor would it be politic to disoblige the Egyptians, who were so considerable a part of his naval forces; nor did he see how she was inferior in prudence to any one of the kings that were serving with him; she had long governed a great kingdom by herself alone, and long lived with him, and gained experience in public affairs. These arguments (so the fate that destined all to Caesar would have it), prevailed; and when all their forces had met, they sailed together to Samos, and held high festivities....

This over, he gave Priene to his players for a habitation, and set sail for Athens, where fresh sports and play-acting employed him. Cleopatra, jealous of the honors Octavia had received at Athens (for Octavia was much beloved by the Athenians), courted the favor of the people with all sorts of attentions. The Athenians, in requital, having decreed her public honors, deputed several of the citizens to wait upon her at her house; amongst whom went Antony as one, he being an Athenian citizen, and he it was that made the speech. He sent orders to Rome to have Octavia removed out of his house. She left it, we are told, accompanied by all his children, except the eldest by Fulvia, who was then with his father, weeping and grieving that she must be looked upon as one of the causes of the war. But the Romans pitied, not so much her, as Antony himself, and more particularly those who had seen Cleopatra, whom they could report to have no way the advantage of Octavia either in youth or in beauty.

The speed and extent of Antony’s preparations alarmed Caesar, who feared he might be forced to fight the decisive battle that summer. For he wanted many necessaries, and the people grudged very much to pay the taxes; freemen being called upon to pay a fourth part of their incomes, and freed slaves an eighth of their property, so that there were loud outrages against him, and disturbances throughout all Italy. And this is looked upon as one of the greatest of Antony’s oversights, that he did not then press the war. For he allowed time at once for Caesar to make his preparations, and for the commotions to pass over. For while people were having their money called for, they were mutinous and violent; but, having paid it, they held their peace. Titius and Plancus, men of consular dignity and friends to Antony, having been ill used by Cleopatra, whom they had most resisted in her design of being present in the war came over to Caesar, and gave information of the contents of Antony’s will, with which they were acquainted. It was deposited in the hands of the vestal virgins, who refused to deliver it up, and sent Caesar word, if he pleased, he should come and seize it himself, which he did. And, reading it over to himself, he noted those places that were most for his purpose, and, having summoned the senate, read them publicly. Many were scandalized at the proceeding, thinking it out of reason and equity to call a man to account for what was not to be until after his death. Caesar specially pressed what Antony said in his will about his burial; for he had ordered that even if he died in the city of Rome, his body, after being carried in state through the forum, should be sent
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to Cleopatra at Alexandria. Calvisius, a dependent of Caesar’s, urged other charges in connection with Cleopatra against Antony; that he had given her the library of Pergamus, containing two hundred thousand distinct volumes; that at a great banquet, in the presence of many guests, he had risen up and rubbed her feet, to fulfil some wager or promise; that he had suffered the Ephesians to salute her as their queen; that he had frequently at the public audience of kings and princes received amorous messages written in tablets made of onyx and crystal, and read them openly on the tribunal; that when Furnius, a man of great authority and eloquence among the Romans, was pleading, Cleopatra happening to pass by in her chair, Antony started up and left them in the middle of their cause, to follow at her side and attend her home.

Calvisius, however, was looking upon as the inventor of most of these stories. Antony’s friends went up and down the city to gain him credit, and sent one of themselves, Geminius, to him, to beg him to take heed and not allow himself to be deprived by yote of his authority, and proclaimed a public enemy to the Roman state. But Geminius no sooner arrived in Greece but he was looked upon as one of Octavia’s spies; at their suppers he was made a continual butt for mockery, and was put to sit in the least honorable places; all which he bore very well, seeking only an occasion of speaking with Antony. So, at supper, being told to say what business he came about, he answered he would keep the rest for a soberer hour, but one thing he had to say, whether full or fasting, that all would go well if Cleopatra would return to Egypt. And on Antony showing his anger at it, “You have done well, Geminius,” said Cleopatra, “to tell your secret without being put to the rack.” So Geminius, after a few days, took occasion to make his escape and go to Rome. Many more of Antony’s friends were drive from him by the insolent usage they had from Cleopatra’s flatterers, amongst whom were Marcus Silanus and Dellius the historian. And Dellius says he was afraid of his life, and that Glaucus, the physician, informed him of Cleopatra’s design against him. She was angry with him for having said that Antony’s friends were served with sour wine, while at Rome Sarmentus, Caesar’s little page (his delicia, as the Romans call it), drank Falernian.

As soon as Caesar had completed his preparations, he had a decree made, declaring war on Cleopatra, and depriving Antony of the authority which he had let a woman exercise in his place. Caesar added that he had drunk potions that had bereaved him of his senses, and that the generals they would have to fight with would be Mardion the eunuch, Pothinus, Iras, Cleopatra’s hairdressing girl, and Charmion, who were Antony’s chief state-councillors.

Questions:
1. What did Lucretia represent in this story about the relationship of the Roman Republic?
2. What is Plutarch’s interpretation of the relationships between Antony, Cleopatra and Octavia?
3. How do Octavia and Lucretia each typify the ideal Roman woman?
4. How could one argue that these women were both manipulators or manipulated in this political/personal situation?
4.3 Slaves in the Roman Countryside

Slaves were an integral part of Roman society and economy. The number of slaves increased drastically in the last century of the Republic and during the early Empire as Roman territory expanded. Below are instructions and advice from three famous Roman writers about how to manage slaves used in agriculture.


FROM COLUMELLA, ON AGRICULTURE

A landowner must be concerned about what responsibility it is best to give each slave and what sort of work to assign to each. I advise that you not appoint a foreman from that type of slave who is physically attractive, and certainly not from the type who has been employed in the city, where all skills are directed toward increasing pleasure. This lazy and sleepy type of slave is accustomed to having a lot of time on his hands, to lounging around the Campus Martius, the Circus Maximus, the theaters, the gambling dens, the snack bars, and the brothels, and he is always dreaming of these same foolish pleasures. If a city slave continues to daydream when he has been transferred to a farm, the landowner suffers the loss not just of the slave but actually of his whole estate. You should therefore choose someone who has been hardened to farm work from infancy, and who has been tested by experience.

The foreman should be given a female companion both to keep him in bounds and also to assist him in certain matters.... He should not be acquainted with the city or the weekly market, except in regard to matters of buying and selling produce, which is his duty.¹

The foreman should choose the slaves’ clothing with an eye to utility rather than fashion, and he should take care to protect them from the wind, cold, and rain with long-sleeved leather tunics, patchwork cloaks, or hooded capes. All of these garments ward off the elements and thus no day is so unbearable that no out-of-doors work can be done. The foreman should not only be skilled in agricultural operations, but also be endowed with such strength and virtue of mind (at least as far as his slave’s personality permits) that he may oversee men neither with laxity nor with cruelty.

There is no better method of maintaining control over even the most worthless of men than demanding hard labor.... After their exhausting toil, they will turn their attention to rest and sleep rather than to fun and games.

It should be an established custom for the landowner to inspect the slaves chained in the prison, to examine whether they are securely chained, whether their quarters are safe and well guarded, whether the foreman has put anyone in chains or released anyone from chains without his master’s knowledge.

A diligent master investigates the quality of his slaves’ food and drink by tasting it himself. He examines their clothing, hand-coverings, and foot-coverings. He should even grant them the opportunity of registering complaints against those who have harmed them either through cruelty or dishonesty.... I have given exemption from work and sometimes even freedom to very fertile female slaves when they have borne many children, since bearing a certain number of offspring ought to be rewarded. For a woman who has three sons, exemption from work is the reward; for a woman who has more, freedom.²

CATO THE ELDER, ON AGRICULTURE

When the master has arrived at his villa and has paid his respects to the household lar³, he should walk around the whole farm, on the same day if possible; if not, on the next day. When he has learned how the farm is being looked after, what work has been done, and what has not been done, he should summon his foreman the next day and ask how much of the work has been completed, how much remains, whether the completed work was done pretty much on time, whether the remaining work can be finished, and how much wine, grain, and other products were produced. When he has received

¹ The foreman obviously had some freedom of movement and could travel back and forth to the market, but was not to linger there to enjoy the attractions of the city.
² Although the mother might be set free, her children remained as slaves. We do not know whether Columella’s willingness to free fertile female slaves was unusual among slave-owners.
³ The Lurs Familiaris was the spirit or deity who protected the household and its members. There was a shrine to this deity in the home, and sacrifices were made to it regularly.
this information, he should calculate what was done in how many days, by how many workers. When the figures are not encouraging, the foreman usually claims that he has worked diligently but “the slaves have been ill,” “the weather has been bad,” the slaves have run away,” etc., etc. When he has given these and many other excuses, call his attention again to your calculation of the work done and the workers used. If the weather has been rainy, remind him of the chores that could have been done on rainy days: washing out wine vats, sealing them with pitch, cleaning the villa, moving grain, hauling out manure, making a manure pit, cleaning seed, mending ropes, and making new ones. The slaves might also have repaired their cloaks and hats. On festival days, old ditches might have been cleaned out, the road repaired, brambles cut down, gardens dug, the meadow cleared, twigs bundled, thorn bushes uprooted, spelt ground, and general cleaning done. When the slaves were sick, he should not have given them so much food. When these things have been calmly pointed out, give orders for the remaining work to be completed. Look over his account books for ready cash, grain, fodder supplies, wine, oil—what has been sold, what payments have been collected, how much is left, and what remains to be sold. Order him to collect outstanding debts and to sell what remains. Order him to provide whatever is needed for the current year, and to sell off whatever is superfluous.... Tell him to scrutinize the herd and hold an auction. Sell your oil, if the price is right, and the surplus wine and grain. Sell off the old oxen, the blemished cattle and sheep, wool, hides, old wagons, old tools, old slaves, sick slaves, and whatever else is superfluous.

Food rations for the slaves: For those who do hard labor, four measures of wheat in winter, four and one-half in the summer. For the foreman, the foreman’s wife, the taskmaster, and the shepherd, three measures. For slaves working in chains, four pounds of bread in the winter, five when they begin to dig the vineyard, and back to four again when the figs appear.

Clothing for the slaves: Provide a tunic weighing three and one-half pounds and a cloak every other year. Whenever you give a tunic or cloak to any of the slaves, first get the old one back; from it, patchwork coverings can be made. You ought to give the slaves sturdy wooden shoes every other year.

FROM VARRO, _ON AGRICULTURE_

The instruments by which the soil is cultivated: Some men divide these into three categories: (1) articulate instruments, i.e., slaves; (2) inarticulate instruments, i.e., oxen; and (3) mute instruments, i.e. carts....

Slaves should be neither timid nor brazen. They ought to have as overseers men who have knowledge of basic reading and writing skills and of some learning.... It is very important that the overseer be experienced in farming operations, for he must not only give orders but also perform the work, so that the other slaves may imitate him and understand that he has been made their overseer for good reason—he is superior to them in knowledge. However, overseers should not be allowed to force obedience with whips rather than words, if words can achieve the same result. Don’t buy too many slaves of the same nationality, for this is very often accustomed to cause domestic quarrels. You should make your foremen more eager to work by giving them rewards and by seeing that they have [monetary rewards] and female companions from among their fellow slaves, who will bear them children.... Slaves become more eager to work when treated generously with respect to food or more clothing or time off or permission to graze some animal of their own on the farm, and other things of this kind. The result is that, when some rather difficult task is asked of them or some rather harsh punishment is meted out, their loyalty and good will toward their master is restored by the consolation of these former generosities.

Questions:
1. How well or badly were slaves regarded and treated in Roman culture?
2. What differences can you see in the three writers' attitude toward slaves?
3. What differences appear between slaves who worked in the countryside on villas and those who lived in city households?
The Romans, as they subdued the Italian nations successively in war, seized a part of their lands and built towns there, or established their own colonies in those already existing, and used them in place of garrisons. Of the land acquired by war they assigned the cultivated part forthwith to settlers, or leased or sold it. Since they had no leisure as yet to allot the part which then lay desolated by war (this was generally the greater part), they made proclamation that in the meantime those who were willing to work it might do so for a share of the yearly crops—a tenth of the grain and a fifth of the fruit. From those who kept flocks was required a share of the animals, both oxen and small cattle. They did these things in order to multiply the Italian race, which they considered the most laborious of peoples, so that they might have plenty of allies at home. But the very opposite thing happened; for the rich, getting possession of the greater part of the undistributed lands, and being emboldened by the lapse of time to believe that they would never be dispossessed, and adding to their holdings the small farms of their poor neighbors, partly by purchase and partly by force, came to cultivate vast tracts instead of single estates, using for this purpose slaves as laborers and herdsmen, lest free laborers should be drawn from agriculture into the army. The ownership of slaves itself brought them great gain from the multitude of their progeny, who increased because they were exempt from military service. Thus the powerful ones became enormously rich and the race of slaves multiplied throughout the country, while the Italian people dwindled in numbers and strength, being oppressed by penury, taxes, and military service. If they had any respite from these evils they passed their time in idleness, because the land was held by the rich, who employed slaves instead of freemen as cultivators.

For these reasons the people became troubled lest they should no longer have sufficient allies of the Italian stock, and lest the government itself should be endangered by such a vast number of slaves. Not perceiving any remedy, as it was not easy, nor exactly just, to deprive men of so many possessions they had held so long, including their own trees, buildings and fixtures, a law was once passed with difficulty at the instance of the tribunes, that nobody should hold more than 500 jugera of this land, or pasture on it more than 100 cattle or 500 sheep. To ensure the observance of this law it was provided also that there should be a certain number of freemen employed on the farms, whose business it should be to watch and report what was going on. Those who held possession of lands under the law were required to take an oath to obey the law, and penalties were fixed for violating it, and it was supposed that the remaining land would soon be divided among the poor in small parcels. But there was not the smallest consideration shown for the law or the oaths. The few who seemed to pay some respect to them conveyed their lands to their relations fraudulently, but the greater part disregarded it altogether.

At length Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, an illustrious man, eager for glory, a most powerful speaker, and for these reasons well known to all, delivered an eloquent discourse, while serving as tribune, concerning the Italian race, lamenting that a people so valiant in war, and blood relations to the Romans, were declining little by little in the pauperism and paucity of numbers without any hope of remedy. He inveighed against the multitude of slaves as useless in war and never faithful to their masters, and adduced the recent calamity brought upon the masters by their slaves in Sicily, where the demands of agriculture had greatly increased the number of the latter; recalling also the war waged against them by the Romans, which was neither easy nor short, but long-protracted and full of vicissitudes and dangers. After speaking thus he again brought forward the law, providing that nobody should hold more than 500 jugera of the public domain. But he added a provision to the former law, that the sons of the present occupiers might each hold one-half of that amount, and that the remainder should be divided among the poor by triumvirs, who should be changed annually.

This was extremely disturbing to the rich because, on account of the triumvirs, they could no longer disregard the law as they had done before; nor could they buy the allotments of others, because Gracchus had provided against this by forbidding sales. They collected together in groups, and made lamentation, and accused the poor of appropriating the results of their tillage, their vineyards, and their dwellings. Some said that they had paid the price of the land to their neighbors. Were they to lose the money with the land? Others said that the graves of their ancestors were in the ground, which had been allotted to them in the division of their fathers’ estates. Others said that their wives’ dowries had been expended on the estates, or that the land had been given to their own daughters as dowry. Money-lenders could show loans made on this security. All kinds of wailing and expressions of indignation were heard at once. On the other side were heard the lamentations of the poor—that they had been reduced from competence to extreme penury, and from that to childlessness, because they were unable to rear their offspring. They recounted the military service they had rendered, by which this very land had been acquired, and were
angry that they should be robbed of their share of the common property. They reproached the rich for employing slaves, who were always faithless and ill-tempered and for that reason unserviceable in war, instead of freemen, citizens, and soldiers. While these classes were lamenting and indulging in mutual accusations, a great number of others, composed of colonists, or inhabitants of the free towns, or persons otherwise interested in the lands and who were under like apprehensions, flocked in and took sides with their respective factions. Emboldened by numbers and exasperated against each other they attached themselves to turbulent crowds, and waited for the voting on the new law, some trying to prevent its enactment by all means, and others supporting it in every possible way. In addition to personal interest the spirit of rivalry spurred both sides in the preparations they were making against each other for the day of the comitia.

What Gracchus had in his mind in proposing the measure was not wealth, but an increase of efficient population. Inspired greatly by the usefulness of the work, and believing that nothing more advantageous of admirable could ever happen to Italy, he took no account of the difficulties surrounding it. When the time for voting came he advanced many other arguments at considerable length and also asked them whether it was not just to divide among the common people what belonged to them in common; whether a citizen was not worthy of more consideration at all times than a slave; whether a man who served in the army was not more useful than one who did not; and whether one who had a share in the country was not more likely to be devoted to the public interests. He did not dwell long on this comparison between freemen and slaves, which he considered degrading, but proceeded at once to a review of their hopes and fears for the country, saying that the Romans had acquired most of their territory by conquest, and that they had hopes of occupying the rest of the habitable world, but now the question of greatest hazard was, whether they should gain the rest by having plenty of brave men, or whether, through their weakness and mutual jealousy, their enemies should take away what they already possessed. After exaggerating the glory and riches on the one side and the danger and fear on the other, he admonished the rich to take heed, and said that for the realization of these hopes they ought to bestow this very land as a free gift, if necessary, on men who would rear children, and not, by contending about small things, overlook larger ones; especially since they were receiving an ample compensation for labor expended in the undisputed title to 500 jugera each of free land, in a high state of cultivation, without cost, and half as much for each son of those who had sons. After saying much more to the same purport and exciting the poor, as well as others who were moved by reason rather than by the desire for gain, he ordered the scribe to read the proposed law.

Marcus Octavius, another tribune, who had been induced by those in possession of the lands to interpose his veto (for among the Romans the tribune’s veto always prevailed), ordered the scribe to keep silence. Thereupon Gracchus reproached him severely and adjourned the comitia to the following day. Then he stationed a sufficient guard, as if to force Octavius against his will, and ordered the scribe with threats to read the proposed law to the multitude. He began to read, but when Octavius again vetoed he stopped. Then the tribunes fell to wrangling with each other, and a considerable tumult arose among the people. The leading citizens besought the tribunes to submit their controversy to the Senate for decision. Gracchus seized on the suggestion, believing that the law was acceptable to all well-disposed persons, and hastened to the senate house. There, as he had only a few followers and was upbraided by the rich, he ran back to the forum and said that he would take the vote at the comitia of the following day, both on the law and on the magistracy of Octavius, to determine whether a tribune who was acting contrary to the people’s interest could continue to hold his office. And so he did, for when Octavius, nothing daunted, again interposed, Gracchus distributed the pebbles to take a vote on him first. When the first tribe voted to abrogate the magistracy of Octavius, Gracchus turned to him and begged him to desist from his veto. As he would not yield, the votes of the other tribes were taken. There were thirty-five tribes at that time. The seventeen that voted first spent an ample compensation for labor expended in the undisputed title to 500 jugera each of free land, in a high state of cultivation, without cost, and half as much for each son of those who had sons. After saying much more to the same purport and exciting the poor, as well as others who were moved by reason rather than by the desire for gain, he ordered the scribe to read the proposed law.

Quintus Mummius was chosen tribune in his place, and the agrarian law was enacted. The first triumvirs appointed to divide the land were Gracchus himself, the prosper of the law, his brother of the same name, and his father-in-law, Appius Claudius, since the people still feared that the law might fail of execution unless Gracchus should be put in the lead with his whole family. Gracchus became immensely popular by reason of the law and was escorted home by the multitude as though he were the founder, not of a single city or race, but of all the nations of Italy. After this the victorious party returned to the fields from which they had come to attend to this business. The defeated ones remained in the city and talked the matter over, feeling bitterly, and saying that as soon as Gracchus should become a private citizen he would be sorry that he had done despite to the sacred and inviolable office of tribune, and had opened such a fountain of discord in Italy.

At the advent of summer the notices for the election of tribunes were given, and as the day for voting approached it was very evident that the rich were earnestly promoting the election of those most inimical to Gracchus. The latter,
fearing that evil would befall if he should not be reelected for the following year, summoned his friends from the fields to attend the comitia, but as they were occupied with their harvest he was obliged, when the day fixed for the voting drew near, to have recourse to the plebeians of the city. So he went around asking each one separately to elect him tribune for the ensuing year, on account of the danger he had incurred for them. When the voting took place the first two tribes pronounced for Gracchus. The rich objected that it was not lawful for the same man to hold the office twice in succession. The tribune Rubrius, who had been chosen by lot to preside over the comitia, was in doubt about it, and Mummius, who had been chosen in place of Octavius, urged him to turn over the comitia to his charge. This he did, but the remaining tribunes contended that the presidency should be decided by lot, saying that when Rubrius, who had been chosen in that way, resigned, the casting of lots ought to be done over again for all. As there was much strife over this question, Gracchus, who was getting the worst of it, adjourned the voting to the following day. In utter despair he clothed himself in black, while still in office, and led his son around the forum and introduced him to each man and committed him to their charge, as if he were about to perish at the hands of his enemies.

The poor were moved with deep sorrow, and rightly so, both on their own account (for they believed that they were no longer to live in a free state under equal laws, but were reduced to servitude by the rich), and on account of Gracchus himself, who had incurred such danger and suffering in their behalf. So they all accompanied him with tears to his house in the evening, and bade him be of good courage for the morrow. Gracchus cheered up, assembled his partisans before daybreak, and communicated to them a signal to be displayed in case of a fight. He then took possession of the temple on the Capitoline hill, where the voting was to take place, and occupied the middle of the assembly. As he was obstructed by the other tribunes and by the rich, who would not allow the votes to be taken on this question, he gave the signal. There was a sudden shout from those who saw it, and a resort to violence in consequence. Some of the partisans of Gracchus took position around him like bodyguards. Others, having girded themselves, seized the fasces* and staves in the hands of the lictors and broke them in pieces. They drove the rich out of the assembly with such disorder and wounds that the tribunes fled from their places in terror, and the priests closed the doors of the temple. Many ran away pell-mell and scattered wild rumors. Some said that Gracchus had deposed all the other tribunes, and this was believed because none of them could be seen. Others said that he had declared himself tribune for the ensuing year without an election.

Under these circumstances the Senate assembled at the temple of Fides. It is astonishing to me that they never thought of appointing a dictator in this emergency, although they had often been protected by the government of a single ruler in such times of peril. Although this resource had been found most useful in former times few people remembered it, either then or later. After reaching the decision that they did reach, they marched up to the Capitol, Cornelius Scipio Nasica, the pontifex maximus [president of the guild of priests—Ed.], leading the way and calling out with a loud voice, “Let those who would save the country follow me.” He wound the border of his toga about his head either to induce a greater number to go with him by the singularity of his appearance, or to make for himself, as it were, a helmet as a sign of battle for those who looked on, or in order to conceal from the gods what he was about to do. When he arrived at the temple and advanced against the partisans of Gracchus they yielded to the reputation of a foremost citizen, for they saw the Senate following with him. The latter wrested clubs out of the hands of the Gracchus themselves, or with fragments of broken benches or other apparatus that had been brought for the use of the assembly, began beating them, and pursued them, and drove them over the precipice. In the tumult many of the Gracchans perished, and Gracchus himself was caught near the temple, and was slain at the door close by the statues of the kings. All the bodies were thrown by night into the Tiber.

So perished on the Capitol, and while still tribune, Gracchus, the son of the Gracchus who was twice consul, and of Cornelia, daughter of that Scipio who subjugated Carthage. He lost his life in consequence of a most excellent design, which, however, he pursued in too violent a manner. This shocking affair, the first that was perpetrated in the public assembly, was seldom without parallels thereafter from time to time. On the subject of the murder of Gracchus the city was divided between sorrow and joy. Some mourned for themselves and for him, and deplored the present condition of things, believing that the commonwealth no longer existed, but had been supplanted by force and violence. Others considered that everything had turned out for them exactly as they wished.

**Questions:**
1. What are the virtues of the land reform plan?
2. Could it have worked?
Part 4: Rome: Republic to Empire

4.5 Polybius: “Why Romans and Not Greeks Govern the World”

An influential Greek politician, Polybius (203 – c. 120 B.C.E.) was deported to Rome in 167 B.C.E. after the Roman defeat of Macedon. Under the protection and patronage of the Scipio family, he became a strong advocate of Roman power. His most famous work was a massive history of Rome in which he sought to explain Rome’s rise to preeminence in the Mediterranean world.


With those Greek states which have often risen to greatness and then experienced a complete change of fortune, it is easy to describe their past and to predict their future. For there is no difficulty in reporting the known facts, and it is not hard to foretell the future by inference from the past. But it is no simple matter to explain the present state of the Roman constitution, nor to predict its future owing to our ignorance of the peculiar features of Roman life in the past. Particular attention and study are therefore required if one wishes to survey clearly the distinctive qualities of Rome’s constitution.

Most writers distinguish three kinds of constitutions: kingship, aristocracy, and democracy. One might ask them whether these three are the sole varieties or rather the best. In either case they are wrong. It is evident that the best constitution is one combining all three varieties, since we have had proof of this not only theoretically but by actual experience, Lycurgus having organized the Spartan state under a constitution based upon this principle. Nor can we agree that these three are the only kinds of states. We have witnessed monarchical and tyrannical governments, which differ sharply from true kingship, yet bear a certain resemblance to it. Several oligarchical constitutions also seem to resemble aristocratic ones. The same applies to democracies.

We must not apply the title of kingship to every monarchy, but must reserve it for one voluntarily accepted by willing subjects who are ruled by good judgment and not be terror and violence. Nor can we call every oligarchy an aristocracy, but only one where the government is in the hands of a selected body of the justest and wisest men. Similarly the name of democracy cannot be applied to a state in which the masses are free to do whatever they wish, but only to a community where it is traditional and customary to reverence the gods, honor one’s parents, respect one’s elders, and obey the laws. Such states, provided the will of the greater number prevails, are to be called democracies.

We should therefore recognize six kinds of governments: the three above mentioned, kingship, aristocracy, and democracy, and the three which are naturally related to them, monarchy, oligarchy, and ochlocracy (mob-rule). The first to arise was monarchy, its growth being natural and unaided: the next is true kingship born from monarchy by planning and reforms. Kingship is transformed into its vicious related form, tyranny; and next, the abolishment of both gives birth to aristocracy. Aristocracy by its very nature degenerates into oligarchy; and when the masses take vengeance on this government for its unjust rule, democracy is born: and in due course the arrogance and lawlessness of this form of government produces mob-rule to complete the cycle. Such is the recurring cycle of constitutions; such is the system devised by nature.

Rome, foreseeing the dangers presented by such a cycle, did not organize her government according to any one type, but rather tried to combine all the good features of the best constitutions. All three kinds of government shared in the control of the Roman state. Such fairness and propriety was shown in the use of these three types in drawing up the constitution, that it was impossible to say with certainty if the whole system was aristocratic, democratic, or monarchical. If one looked at the power of the Consuls, the constitution seemed completely monarchical; if at that of the Senate, it seemed aristocratic; and if at the power of the masses, it seemed clearly to be a democracy.

Roman Consuls exercise authority over all public affairs. All other magistrates except the tribunes are under them and bound to obey them, and they introduce embassies to the Senate. They consult the Senate on matters of urgency, they carry out in detail the provisions of its decrees, they summon assemblies, introduce measures, and preside over the execution of popular decrees. In war their power is almost uncontrolled; for they are empowered to make demands on allies, to appoint military tribunes, and to select soldiers. They also have the right of inflicting punishment on anyone under their command, and spending any sum they decide upon from the public funds. If one looks at this part of the administration alone, one may reasonably pronounce the constitution to be a pure monarchy or kingship.
To pass to the Senate: in the first place it has the control of the treasury, all revenue and expenditure being regulated by it; with the exception of payments made to the consuls, no disbursements are made without a decree of the Senate. Public works, whether constructions or repairs, are under the control of the Senate. Crimes such as treason, conspiracy, poisoning, and assassination, as well as civil disputes, are under the jurisdiction of the Senate. The Senate also sends all embassies to foreign countries to settle differences, impose demands, receive submission, or declare war; and with respect to embassies arriving in Rome it decides what reception and what answer should be given to them. All these matters are in the hands of the Senate, so that in these respects the constitution appears to be entirely aristocratic.

After this we are naturally inclined to ask what part in the constitution is left for the people. The Senate controls all the particular matters I mentioned and manages all finances, and the Consuls have uncontrolled authority as regards armaments and operations in the field. But there is a very important part left for the people. For the people alone have the right to confer honors and inflict punishment, the only bonds by which human society is held together. For where the distinction between rewards and punishment is overlooked, or is observed but badly applied, no affairs can be properly administered. For how can one expect rational administration when good and evil men are held in equal estimation? The people judge cases punishable by a fine, especially when the accused have held high office. In capital cases they are the sole judges. It is the people who bestow office on the deserving, the noblest reward of virtue in a state; the people have the power of approving or rejecting laws, and what is most important of all, they deliberate on questions of war and peace. Further in the case of alliances, terms of peace, and treaties, it is the people who ratify all these. Thus one might plausibly say that the people’s share in the government is the greatest, and that the constitution is a democratic one.

Having stated how political power is distributed among the three constitutional forms, I will now explain how each of the three parts is enabled, if they wish, to oppose or cooperate with the other parts. The Consul, when he leaves with his army, appears to have absolute authority in all matters necessary for carrying out his purpose; however, in fact he really requires the support of the people and the Senate. For the legions require constant supplies, and without the consent of the Senate, neither grain, clothing, nor pay can be provided; so that the commander’s plans come to nothing, if the Senate chooses to impede them. As for the people it is indispensable for the Consuls to conciliate them, however far away from home they may be; for it is the people who ratify or annual treaties, and what is most important, the Consuls are obliged to account for their actions to the people. So it is not safe for the Consuls to underestimate the importance of the good will of either the Senate or the people.

The Senate, which possess such great power, is obliged to respect the wishes of the people, and it cannot carry out inquiries into the most grave offenses against the state, unless confirmed by the people. The people alone have the power of passing or rejecting any law meant to deprive the Senate of some of its traditional authority. Therefore the Senate is afraid of the masses and must pay due attention to the popular will.

Similarly, the people are dependent on the Senate and must respect its members both in public and in private. Through the whole of Italy a vast number of contracts, which it would not be easy to enumerate, are given out by the Senate for the construction and repair of public buildings, and besides this there are many things which are farmed out, such as navigable rivers, harbors, gardens, mines, lands, in fact everything that forms part of the Roman domains. Now all these matters are undertaken by the people, and everyone is interested in these contracts and the work they involve. Certain people are the actual purchasers of the contracts, others are the partners of these first, others guarantee them, others pledge their own fortunes to the state for this purpose. In all these matters the Senate is supreme. It can grant extension of time; it can relieve the contractor if any accident occurs; and if the work proves to be absolutely impossible to carry out it can liberate him from his contract. There are many ways in which the Senate can either benefit or injure those who manage public property. What is even more important is that the judges in most civil trials are appointed from the Senate. As a result of the fact that all citizens are at the mercy of the Senate, and look forward with alarm to the uncertainty of litigation, they are very shy of obstructing or resisting its decisions. Similarly anyone is reluctant to oppose the projects of the Consuls as all are generally and individually under their authority when in the field.
Such being the power that each part has of hampering the others or cooperating with them, their union is adequate to all emergencies, so that it is impossible to find a better political system than this. Whenever the menace of some common danger from abroad compels them to act in concord and support each other, the strength of the state becomes great, as all are zealously competing in devising means of meeting the need of the hour. Consequently, this peculiar form of constitution possesses an irresistible power of attaining every object upon which it is resolved. When they are freed from external menace, and reap the harvest of good fortune and affluence which is the result of their success, and in the enjoyment of this prosperity are corrupted by flattery and idleness and become insolent and overbearing, as indeed happens often enough, it is then especially that we see the state providing itself a remedy for the evil from which it suffers. For when one part having grown out of proportion to the others aims at supremacy and tends to become too predominant, it is evident that none of the three is absolute. The purpose of one can be offset and resisted by the others, and none of them will excessively outgrow the others or treat them with contempt. All parts abide by the traditional constitutional practices because any aggressive impulse is sure to be checked and because they fear from the outset the possibility of being interfered with by the others.

Questions:
1. Why does Polybius think that checks and balances have given lasting stability to the Roman political system?
2. How does Polybius divide the Roman government into branches? How is his tripartite division both similar to and different from the system outlined in the U.S. Constitution?
3. How does aristocracy fit into the Roman system, according to Polybius? Does the concept of aristocracy play any part of the U.S. Constitution?
4.6 Marcus Tullius Cicero: The Laws

Marcus Tullius Cicero (106 – 43 B.C.E.) was the greatest of all Roman orators. An opponent of Julius Caesar, he was put to death when Octavius emerged triumphant in the civil war that followed Caesar’s assassination. In the selection from his De legibus libri included here, Cicero argued that all true laws reflect nature.


Those learned men appear to be right who say that law is the highest reason implanted in Nature, which commands what should be done and prohibits what should not be: when this same reason takes root and develops in the human mind it is law. Thus they consider law to be intelligence which has the power to command people to do what is right and to refrain from what is wrong. . . . The way Nature has made us let us share the concept of justice with each other and pass it on to all men. . . . Those human beings to whom Nature gave reason were also give right reason in matters of command and prohibition. . . .

From the time we were children, we have been calling rules that begin: “If a man makes a complaint in court” and similar things by the name “laws.” It would be good now if we could establish that with commands to do things or refrain from doing them nations apply the power to steer people towards doing the right things and away from committing crimes; however, this power is not only older than peoples and governments but is of the same age as the God who protects and rules both Heaven and earth. You see, the divine mind cannot exist without reason, and divine reason must have the power to sanction what is right and wrong.

Nothing was ever written to say that one man alone on a bridge should face massed, armed forces of enemies and command the bridge behind him to be destroyed, but that fact should not mislead us into thinking that [Horatio] Cocles was not following to the utmost the law which summons us to deeds of bravery. If there has been no written law in Rome against rape back when Lucius Tarquin ruled as king, that would not mean that Sextus Tarquin was not breaking that eternal law when he took Lucretia by force. . . . The fact is that reason did exist, a gift of Nature, calling upon man to do right and abstain from wrong. It did not begin to be law when it first came into being, which it did at the same time as the divine mind. . . . The varied ordinances formulated for monetary needs of the peoples bear the name “laws” through being so favored by conventional usage rather than because they are really laws. . . . Men introduced such laws to insure the protection of citizens and states, as well as the peaceful and happy lot of mankind. Those who originated these sanctions persuaded their people that what they were writing down and putting into effect would—if the people lived by them—give them happiness and honor. When these sanctions were formulated and went into effect they were indeed called “laws.”

How about all the pernicious and pestilential bits of legislation which nations have been known to enact? These no more deserve the name “laws” than the agreements that gangs of robbers might make among themselves. We know that if ignorant and inexperienced men should recommend poisons instead of medicines with the power to heal these would not be called “physicians’ prescriptions.” In the same way, nothing causing injury should be called a “law,” no matter how it may have been enacted by a state or how the people may accept it. Thus we find that law reflects justice, distinct from injustice, and comes from that most ancient and rightfully dominant of all things: Nature, which all human laws reflect when they punish evildoers while defending and protecting good people.

Questions:
1. Why does Cicero consider Natural Law to have greater power than man-made law? Do you? Why?
2. Why do you suppose that most twentieth-century lawyers prefer not to argue their cases in terms of Natural Law? Can you think of some cases in which Natural Law argumentation has won out?
4.7 A Marriage Contract

The following marriage contract was drawn up in Egypt in 13 B.C.E. Since Egypt had only become a Roman province in 30 B.C.E., it is likely that it was as much [or more] influenced by Egyptian and Greek-Hellenistic procedure as by Roman practice.


To Protarchus, from Thermion daughter of Apion, accompanied by her guardian Apollonius son of Chaereas, and from Apollonius son of Ptolemaeus:—

Thermion and Apollonius son of Ptolemaeus agree that they have come together for the purpose of sharing their lives with one another. The above-mentioned Apollonius son of Ptolemaeus agrees that he has received from Thermion, handed over from her household as a dowry, a pair of gold earrings.... From now on he will furnish Thermion, as his wedded wife, with all necessities clothing according to his means, and he will not mistreat her or cast her out or insult her or bring in another wife; otherwise he must at once return the dowry and in addition half again as much.

And Thermion will fulfill her duties toward her husband and her marriage, and will not sleep away from the house or be absent one day without the consent of Apollonius son of Ptolemaeus and will not damage or injure their common home and will not consort with another man; otherwise she, if judged guilty of these actions, will be deprived of her dowry, and in addition the transgressor will be liable to the prescribed fine. Dated the 17th year of Caesar [Augustus],

Questions:
1. How does this marriage contract compare to Greek and Roman laws regarding women and marriage?
2. What is expected of the man and the woman in marriage?
3. What do these expectations tell us about the nature of marriage in Hellenistic/Roman Alexandria?
5.1 Augustus’ Moral Legislation: Family Values

In 18 B.C.E. Augustus launched his program of social and moral reform. Concerned about public morality and worried about the continued domination of Italians in the Empire, he enacted laws curbing adultery, promoting marriage, and encouraging childbearing.


VARIOUS LEGAL SOURCES, COLLECTED IN REGIA ACADEMIA ITALICA, ACTA DIVI AUGUSTI, PARS PRIOR (ROME 1945) PP. 112-28 (ABRIDGED).

“No one shall hereafter commit debauchery or adultery knowingly and with malice aforethought.” These words of the law apply to him who abets as well as to him who commits debauchery or adultery.

The Julian Law on Curbing Adultery punishes not only defilers of the marriages of others... but also the crime of debauchery when anyone without the use of force violates either a virgin or a widow of respectable character.

By the second section [of the law] a father, if he catches an adulterer of his daughter... in his own home or that of his son-in-law, or if the latter summons him in such an affair, is permitted to kill that adulterer with impunity, just as he may forthwith kill his daughter.

A husband also is permitted to kill an adulterer of his wife, but not anyone at all as is the father’s right. For this law provides that a husband is permitted to kill [a procurer, actor, gladiator, convicted criminal, freedman, or slave] caught in the act of adultery with his wife in his own home (but not in that of his father-in-law). And it directs a husband who has killed any one of these to divorce his wife without delay. Moreover, he must make a report to the official who has jurisdiction in the place where the killing has occurred and he must divorce his wife; if he does not do this, he does not slay with impunity.

The law punishes as a procurer a husband who retains his wife after she has been caught in adultery and lets the adulterer go (for he ought to be enraged at his wife, who violated his marriage). In such a case the husband should be punished since he cannot claim the excuse of ignorance or feign patience on the pretext of not believing it.

He by whose aid or advice with malice aforethought it is made possible for a man or woman caught in adultery to evade punishment through bribe or any other collusion is condemned to the same penalty as is fixed for those who are convict of the crime of procuring.

He who makes a profit from the adultery of his wife is scourged.

If a wife receives any profit from the adultery of her husband she is liable under the Julian Law as if she were an adulteress.... Anyone who marries a woman convicted of adultery is liable under this law.

It was enacted that women convicted of adultery be punished by confiscation of half of their dowry and a third of their property and by relegation to an island, and that the male adulterers be punished by like relegation to an island and by confiscation of half of their property, with the proviso that they be relegated to different islands.

Suetonius Life of Augustus XXXIV

Among the laws which he revised or enacted were a sumptuary law and laws on adultery and chastity, on bribery, and on classes permitted to marry. The last of these he amended somewhat more severely than the others, but in the face of the clamor of opposition he was unable to push it through until he had withdrawn or mitigated some of the penalties and increased the rewards.... And when he saw that the intent of the law was being evaded by betrothal with immature girls and by frequent changes of wives, he shortened the duration of betrothals¹ and set a limit on divorces.

¹ He ordered that girls might not be betrothed before the age of ten, and he limited the duration of betrothals to a maximum of two years. Tacitus adds (Annals, xxviii) that the rewards offered for successful prosecution of evaders of these laws stimulated the rise of professional spies and informers.
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He laid heavier assessments upon the unmarried men and women and on the other hand offered prizes for marriage and the begetting of children. And since among the nobility there were far more males than females, he allowed all [free men] who wished, except senators, to marry freedwomen, and ordered that their offspring should be held legitimate.

TACITUS ANNALS III. XXV

Augustus in his old age supplemented the Julian Laws with the Papian-Poppaeaean Law in order to increase the penalties on celibacy and enrich the treasury. But people were not driven thereby to marriage and the rearing of children in any great numbers, so powerful were the attractions of the childless state. Instead the number of persons courting danger grew steadily greater, for every household was undermined by the denunciations of informers; and now the country suffered from its laws, as it had previously suffered from its vices.

VARIOUS LEGAL SOURCES, COLLECTED IN REGIA ACADEMIA ITALICA, ACTA DIVI AUGUSTI, PARS PRIOR (ROME, 1945) PP. 112-28 (ABRIDGED IN THE COLLECTION CITED ABOVE).

The Julian Law provides as follows:

No one who is or shall be a senator, or a son, grandson born of a son, or great-grandson born of a son’s son of any one of these, shall knowingly and with malice aforethought have as betrothed or wife a freedwoman or any woman who herself or whose father or mother is or has been an actor.

And no daughter of a senator or granddaughter born of a son or great-granddaughter born of a grandson (a son’s son) shall knowingly and with malice aforethought be betrothed or married to a freedman or to a man who himself or whose father or mother is or has been an actor, and no such man shall knowingly and with malice aforethought have her as betrothed or wife.

Freeborn men are forbidden to marry a prostitute, a procuress, a woman manumitted by a procurer or procuress, one caught in adultery, one convicted in a public action, or one who has been an actress.

Conditions added contrary to laws and imperial decrees or to morality—such as, “if you do not marry,” or “if you have no children”—carry no weight.

In the seventh section of the Julian Law priority in assuming the fasces² is given not to the consul who is older but to the one who has more children than his colleague either in his power³ or lost in war.

.... But if both are married and the fathers of the same number of children, then the time-honored practice is restored and the one who is older assumes the fasces first.

A freedwoman who is married to her patron shall not have the right of divorce... as long as the patron wants her to be his wife.

A man or wife can, by virtue of marriage, inherit a tenth of the other’s estate. But if they have living children from a previous marriage, in addition to the tenth which they take by virtue of marriage they receive as many tenths as the number of children. Likewise a common son or daughter lost after the day of naming adds one tenth, and two lost after the ninth day add two tenths. Besides the tenth they can receive also the usufruct of a third part of the estate, and whenever they have children the ownership of the same part.

Sometimes a man or wife can inherit the other’s entire estate, for example, if both or either are not yet of the age at which the law requires children—that is, if the husband is under twenty-five and the wife under twenty; or if both have while married past the age prescribed by the Papian Law—that is, the man sixty, the woman fifty...

Sometimes they inherit nothing from each other, that is, if they contract a marriage contrary to the Julian and Papian-Poppaeaean Law (for example if anyone marries a woman of ill repute or a senator marries a freedwoman).

---

² The ancient symbols of Roman imperium, power.
³ That is, minors or unmarried females.
Bachelors also are forbidden by the Julian Law to receive inheritances or legacies.... Likewise by the Papian Law childless persons, precisely because they have no children, lose one half of inheritances and legacies.

The Julian Law exempted women from marriage for one year after the death of a husband and six months after a divorce; the Papian Law [raised these to] two years after the death of a husband and a year and six months after a divorce.

In keeping with the thirty-fifth section of the Julian Law, those who without just cause prevent any children in their power from marrying or refuse to give a dowry... are compelled to give them in marriage and bestow dowry.

If there is no one entitled to the possession of an estate, or if there is someone but he has failed to exercise his right, the estate passes to the public treasury.

Questions:
1. How were men and women treated differently under this legislation?
2. From the opinions expressed in the readings, how effective do you think these laws were in achieving Augustus’ goals?
5.2 A Satirical View of Women

Juvenal (ca. 55–ca. 130 C.E.), called “the greatest satiric poet who ever lived,” wrote sixteen Satires which luridly reveal the glaring vices and follies of Roman society at the end of the first century C.E. In his Sixth Satire, Juvenal denounces the emancipated upper-class women of Rome for breaching social conventions and moral standards.


Yet a musical wife’s not so bad as some presumptuous
Flat-chested busybody who rushes around the town
Gate-crashing all-male meetings, talking back straight-faced
To a uniformed general—and in her husband’s presence.
She knows all the news of the world, what’s cooking in
Thrace
Or China, just what the stepmother did with her stepson
Behind closed doors, who’s fallen in love, which gallant
Is all the rage. She’ll tell you who got the widow
Pregnant, and in which month; she knows each woman’s
Pillow endearments, and all the positions she favors.
She’s the first to spot any comet presaging trouble
For some eastern prince, in Armenia, maybe,
or Parthia.

She’s on to the latest gossip and rumors as soon as
They reach the city-gates, or invents her own, informing
Everyone she meets that Niphates has overflowed
And is inundating whole countries—towns are cut off,
She says, and the land is sinking: flood and disaster! Yet
even this is not so insufferable
As her habit, when woken up, of grabbing some poor-class
Neighbor and belting into him with a whip. If her precious
Sleep is broken by barking, ‘Fetch me the cudgels,’
She roars, ‘and be quick about it!’ The dog gets a
thraghing,
But its master gets one first. She’s no joke to cross,
And her face is a grisly fright. Not till the evening
Does she visit the baths: only then are her oil-jars and
The rest of her clobber transferred there. First she works
out
With the weights and dumb-bells. Then, when her arms
are aching,
The masseur takes over, craftily slipping one hand
Along her thigh, and tickling her up till she comes.
Lastly she makes for the sweat-room. She loves to sit there
Amid all that hubbub, perspiring. Meanwhile at home
Her unfortunate guests are nearly dead with hunger.
At last she appears, all flushed, with a three-gallon thirst,

Enough to empty the brimming jar at her feet
Without assistance. She knocks back two straight pints
On an empty stomach, to sharpen her appetite: then
Throws it all up again, souses the floor with vomit
That flows in rivers across the terrazzo. She drinks
And spews by turns, like some big snake that’s tumbled
Into a wine-vat, till her gilded jordan brims
Right over with sour and vinous slops. Quite sickened,
Eyes shut, her husband somehow holds down his bile.
Worse still is the well-read menace, who’s hardly settled
for dinner
Before she starts praising Virgil, making a moral case
For Dido (death justifies all), comparing, evaluating
Rival poets, Virgil and Homer suspended
In opposite scales, weighed up one against the other.
Critics surrender, academics are routed, all
Fall silent, not a word from lawyer or auctioneer—
Or even another woman. Such a rattle of talk,
You’d think all the poets and bells were being clashed
together

Questions:
1. How familiar do any of Juvenal’s complaints about women and the city sound in the context of our times?
2. Written in satire, how seriously can we take Juvenal’s descriptions and opinions of life and people?
3. What does this selection reveal about the tenor of Roman culture and society at the end of the first century C.E.?
5.3 Traditional Roman Religious Practices

Roman religion was a religion of ritual and form, rather than of ideas and beliefs, and did not teach ethics or demand good works. Morality and ethical behavior were a family and civic responsibility, rather than a religious one. The first several selections illustrate common religious practices. By the fourth century C.E., however, Christianity began to win the support of the emperors, and in 392 the emperor Theodosius I banned all non-Christian rites. Christianity thus became the one official state religion. The last selection is an appeal to the Roman Emperor by Symmachus (ca. 340–402 C.E.), who had not converted from the old religion to Christianity. He requested that the altar of Victory erected by Augustus that had been removed from the Senate by the previous Christian Emperor be returned. He was unsuccessful.


A HYMN TO DIANA, BY CATULLUS, POEMS

Diana, we are in your care, we chaste girls and boys. Come, chaste boys and girls, let us sing in praise of Diana.

O daughter of Leto, mighty offspring of mightiest Jupiter, you who were born beside the Delian olive tree, queen of the mountains and the green forests and the trackless glens and the murmuring streams.

You are called Juno Lucina by women in the agony of childbirth. You are called powerful Trivia. You are called Luna, with your borrowed light.

You, goddess, measuring out the year’s progress by your monthly phases, do fill the farmer’s humble storerooms with fine produce.

Hallowed be thy name, whatever name it is that you prefer. And, as in years past you have been accustomed to do, so now, too, protect and preserve the race of Romulus with your kindly favor.

PLINY THE ELDER, NATURAL HISTORY

It apparently does no good to offer a sacrifice or to consult the gods with due ceremony unless you also speak words of prayer. In addition, some words are appropriate for seeking favorable omens, others for warding off evil, and still others for securing help. We notice, for example, that our highest magistrates make appeals to the gods with specific and set prayers. And in order that no word be omitted or spoken out of turn, one attendant reads the prayer from a book, another is assigned to check it closely, a third is appointed to enforce silence. In addition, a flutist plays to block out any extraneous sounds. There are recorded remarkable cases where either ill-omened noises have interrupted and ruined the ritual or an error has been made in the strict wording of the prayer.

CATO THE ELDER, ON AGRICULTURE

Before you harvest your crops, you should offer a sow as a preliminary sacrifice in the following manner. Offer a sow to Ceres before you store up the following crops: spelt, wheat, barley, beans, and rape seed. Before you slaughter the sow, invoke Janus,1 Jupiter, and Juno, offering incense and wine.

Offer sacrificial crackers to Janus with the following words: “Father Janus, in offering to you these sacrificial crackers I humbly pray that you may be benevolent and well disposed toward me and my children and my home and my family.”

Offer an oblation cracker to Jupiter and honor him with the following words: “Jupiter, in offering to you this oblation cracker I humbly pray that you may be benevolent and well disposed toward me and my children and my home and my family, being honored by this oblation cracker.”

Afterward offer wine to Janus with the following words: “Father Janus, just as I humbly prayed when I offered to you the sacrificial crackers, so now for the same purpose be honored with sacrificial wine.”

1 Janus was the god of all beginnings (January) and thus appropriately invoked at the beginning of the harvest. He was also the god of doorways and was frequently represented as having two faces, each looking in the opposite direction, even as a door has two faces.
And afterward offer wine to Jupiter with the following words: “Jupiter, be honored by the oblation cracker, be honored by the sacrificial wine.”

And then slaughter the sow as a preliminary sacrifice. When the internal organs have been cut out,² offer sacrificial crackers to Janus and honor him in the same terms as when you earlier offered him crackers. Offer an oblation cracker to Jupiter and honor him in the same terms as before. Likewise, offer wine to Janus and offer wine to Jupiter in the same terms as it was offered when you earlier offered the sacrificial crackers and the oblation crackers. Afterward offer the internal organs and wine to Ceres.

**CATO THE ELDER, ON AGRICULTURE 141**

It is necessary to purify your farmland in the following way. Have a pig-sheep-bull procession led around the land, while the following words are spoken: “With the benevolence of the gods, and hoping that everything may turn out well, I entrust to you the responsibility of having the pig-sheep-bull procession led around my farm, field, and land, wherever you decide the animals ought to be led or carried.”

Invoke Janus and Jupiter with an offering of wine; then speak these words: ‘Father Mars, I pray and entreat you to be benevolent and well disposed toward me and my home and my family. And for this reason I have ordered a pig-sheep-bull procession to be led around my field, land, and farm, so that you will hinder, ward off, and turn away diseases seen and unseen, barrenness and crop losses, disasters and storms; and so that you will allow the vegetable crops, the grain crops, the vineyards, and the orchards to grow and achieve a productive maturity; and so that you will protect the shepherds and the flocks and bestow safety and good health upon me and my home and my family. For these reasons, therefore, and because of the purifying of my farm, land, and field, and the offering of a sacrifice for purification, even as I have prayed, be honored by the sacrifice of the suckling pig-sheep-bull. For this reason, therefore, Father Mars, be honored by this suckling pig-sheep-bull sacrifice.”

Slaughter the sacrificial animals with a knife. Bring forward sacrificial crackers, and an oblation cracker, and offer them. When you slaughter the pig, lamb, and calf, you must use these words:

“For this reason, therefore, be honored by the sacrifice of the pig-sheep-bull.”... If all the sacrificial victims are not perfect, speak these words: “Father Mars, if somehow the suckling pig-sheep-bull sacrifice was not satisfactory to you, I offer this new pig-sheep-bull sacrifice as atonement.” If there is doubt about only one or two of the animals, speak these words: “Father Mars, since that pig was not satisfactory to you, I offer this pig as atonement.”

**SYMMACHUS, DISPATCHES TO THE EMPEROR**

Every man has his own customs and his own religious practices. Similarly, the divine mind has given to different cities different religious rites which protect them. And, just as each man receives at birth his own soul, so, too, does each nation receive a genius³ which guides its destiny. We should also take into account the bestowal of favors, which, more than anything else, proves to man the existence of gods. For, since no human reasoning can illuminate this matter, from where else can knowledge of the gods come, and come more correctly, than from the recollection and evidences of prosperity? If the long passage of time gives validity to religious rites, we must keep faith with so many centuries and we must follow our fathers, who followed their fathers and therefore prospered.

Let us imagine that Rome herself is standing before us now and addressing these words to you:

“Best of emperors, fathers of the fatherland, respect my age! The dutiful performance of religious rites has carried me through many years. Let me enjoy the ancient ceremonies, for I do not regret them. Let me live in my own way, for I am free. This is the religion which made the whole world obedient to my laws. These are the rites which drove back Hannibal from my walls and the Senones from my Capitol. Have I been preserved only for this—to be rebuked in my old age? I will consider the changes which people think must be instituted, but modification, in old age, is humiliating and too late.”

---

² The internal organs were first inspected carefully to ascertain the will of the gods [taking an augury] and then burned on the altar. The rest of the pig was eaten by the people who witnessed the sacrifice.

³ Guardian Spirit.
And so we are asking for amnesty for the gods of our fathers, the gods of our homeland. It is reasonable to assume that whatever each of us worships can be considered one and the same. We look up at the same stars, the same sky is above us all, the same universe encompasses us. What difference does it make which system each of us uses to find the truth? It is not by just one route that man can arrive at so great a mystery.

Questions:
1. What were the basic elements of Roman prayers and rituals?
2. How do the prayers and rituals illustrate the nature and characteristics of traditional Roman religion?
3. What argument does Symmachus use to support his request for the return of the altar of Victory? Why do you think the fourth-century Christians did not find this argument persuasive?
5.4 The Gospel According to Luke


1 Inasmuch as many have undertaken to compile a narrative of the things which have been accomplished among us, 2 just as they were delivered to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the world, 3 it seemed good to me also, having followed all things closely 4 for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent The-oph’ilus, 4 that you may know the truth concerning the things of which you have been informed.

5 In the days of Herod, king of Judea, there was a priest named Zechari’ah, b of the division of Abi’jah; and he had a wife of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elizabeth. 6 And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless. 7 But they had no child, because Elizabeth was barren, and both were advanced in years.

8 Now while he was serving as priest before God when his division was on duty, 9 according to the custom of the priesthood, it fell to him by lot to enter the temple of the Lord and burn incense. 10 And the whole multitude of the people were praying outside at the hour of incense. 11 And there appeared to him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense. 12 And Zechari’ah was troubled when he saw him, and fear fell upon him. 13 But the angel said to him, “Do not be afraid, Zechari’ah, for your prayer is heard, and your wife Elizabeth will bear you a son, and you shall call his name John. 14 And you will have joy and gladness, and many will rejoice at his birth; 15 for he will be great before the Lord, and he shall drink no wine nor strong drink, and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother’s womb. 16 And he will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God, 17 and he will go before him in the spirit and power of Eli’jah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready for the Lord a people prepared.”

18 And Zechari’ah said to the angel, “How shall I know this? For I am an old man and my wife is advanced in years.” 19 And the angel answered him, “I am Gabriel, who stand in the presence of God; and I was sent to speak to you, and to bring you this good news. 20 And behold, you will be silent and unable to speak until the day that these things come to pass, because you did not believe my words, which will be fulfilled in their time.” 21 And the people were waiting for Zechari’ah, and they wondered at this delay in the temple. 22 And when he came out, he could not speak to them, and they perceived that he had seen a vision in the temple; and he made signs to them and remained dumb. 23 And when his time of service was ended, he went to his home.

24 After these days his wife Elizabeth conceived, and for five months she hid herself, saying, 25 “Thus the Lord has done to me in the days when he looked on me, to take away my reproach among men.”

26 In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God to a city of Galilee named Nazareth, 27 to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin’s name was Mary. 28 And he came to her and said, “Hail, O favored one, the Lord is with you!” c 29 But she was greatly troubled at the saying, and considered in her mind what sort of greeting this might be. 30 And the angel said to her, “Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God. 31 And behold, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you shall call his name Jesus. 32 He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David, 33 and he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there will be no end.” 34 And Mary said to the angel, “How can this be, since I have no husband?” 35 And the angel said to her, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born d will be called holy, the Son of God.

---

a Or accurately
b Greek Zacharias
c Other ancient authorities add “Blessed are you among women!”
d Other ancient authorities add of you

1, 2: 1 Jn. 1. 1; Acts 1. 21; Heb. 2. 3. 1. 3: Acts 1. 1. 2. 4: Jn. 20. 31. 1. 5: Mt. 2. 1. 1 Chron. 24. 10; 2 Chron. 31. 2. 1. 9: Ex. 30. 7. 1. 11: Lk. 2. 9; Acts 5. 19. 1. 13: Lk. 1. 30. 60. 1. 15: Num. 6. 3; Lk. 7. 33. 1. 17: Mt. 11. 14; 11. 17; Mal. 4. 5. 1. 18: K. 1. 34. 1. 19: Dan. 8. 16; 9. 21; Mt. 18. 10. 1. 25: Gen. 30. 23; Is. 4. 1.
36 And behold, your kinswoman Elizabeth in her old age has also conceived a son; and this is the sixth month with her who was called barren. 37 For with God nothing will be impossible.” 38 And Mary said, “Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord; let it be to me according to your word.” And the angel departed from her.

39 In those days Mary arose and went with haste into the hill country, to a city of Judah, 40 and she entered the house of Zechari’ah and greeted Elizabeth. 41 And when Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit 42 and she exclaimed with a loud cry, “Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb! 43 And why is this granted me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? 44 For behold, when the voice of your greeting came to my ears, the babe in my womb leaped for joy. 45 And blessed is she who believed that there would be a fulfillment of what was spoken to her from the Lord.”

46 And Mary said, “My soul magnifies the Lord, 47 and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior, 48 for he has regarded the low estate of his handmaid. For behold, henceforth all generations will call me blessed; 49 for he who is mighty has done great things for me, and holy is his name. 50 And his mercy is on those who fear him from generation to generation. 51 He has shown strength with his arm, he has scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts, 52 he has put down the mighty from their thrones, and exalted those of low degree; 53 he has filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he has sent empty away. 54 He has helped his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy, 55 as he spoke to our fathers, to Abraham and to his posterity for ever.”

56 And Mary remained with her about three months, and returned to her home. 57 Now the time came for Elizabeth to be delivered, and she gave birth to a son. 58 And her neighbors and kinsfolk heard that the Lord had shown great mercy to her, and they rejoiced with her. 59 And on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they would have named him Zechari’ah after his father, 60 but his mother said, “Not so; he shall be called John.” 61 And they said to her, “None of your kindred is called by this name.” 62 And they made signs to his father, inquiring what he would have him called. 63 And he asked for a writing tablet, and wrote, “His name is John.” And they all marveled. 64 And immediately his mouth was opened and his tongue loosened, and he spoke, blessing God.

65 And fear came on all their neighbors. And all these things were talked about through all the hill country of Judea; 66 and all who heard them laid them up in their hearts, saying, “What then will this child be?” For the hand of the Lord was with him.

67 And his father Zechari’ah was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied, saying,

68 “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited and redeemed his people, 69 and has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, 70 as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old, 71 that we should be saved from other enemies, and from the hand of all who hate us; 72 to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant, 73 the oath which he swore to our father Abraham, 74 to grant us that we, being delivered from the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, 75 in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of our life. 76 And you, child, will be called the prophet of the Most High; for you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways, 77 to give knowledge of salvation to his people in the forgiveness of their sins, 78 through the tender mercy of our God, when the day shall dawn upon us 79 to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.”

80 And the child grew and became strong in spirit, and he was in the wilderness till the day of his manifestation to Israel.

2 In those days a decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled. 2 This was the first enrollment, when Quirin’i-us was governor of Syria. 3 And all went to be enrolled, each to his own city. 4 And Joseph also went up from Galilee, from the City of Nazareth, to Judea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David, 5 to be enrolled with Mary, his betrothed, who was with child. 6 And while they were there, the time came for her to be delivered. 7 And she gave birth to her first-born son and wrapped him in swaddling cloths, and laid him in a manger, because there was no place for them in the inn.

8 And in that region there were shepherds out in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night. 9 And an angel of the Lord appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were filled with fear.

10 And the angel said to them, “Be not afraid; for behold, I bring you good news of a great joy which will come to all the people; 11 for to you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord. 12 And this will be a sign for you: you will find a babe wrapped in swaddling cloths and lying in a manger.” 13 And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying,

---

\*\* Or believed, for there will be\*\*
\* Or whereby the dayspring will visit. Other ancient authorities read since the dayspring has visited
14 “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men with whom he is pleased!”

15 When the angels went away from them into heaven, the shepherds said to one another, “Let us go over to Bethlehem and see this thing that has happened, which the Lord has made known to us.” And they went with haste, and found Mary and Joseph, and the babe lying in a manger. And when they saw it they made known the saying which had been told them concerning this child; and all who heard it wondered at what the shepherds told them. But Mary kept all these things, pondering them in her heart. And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all they had heard and seen, as it had been told them.

21 And at the end of eight days, when he was circumcised, he was called Jesus, the name given by the angel before he was conceived in the womb.

22 And when the time came for their purification according to the law of Moses, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord (as it is written in the law of the Lord, “Every male that opens the womb shall be called holy to the Lord”) And to offer a sacrifice according to what is said in the law of the Lord, “a pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons.”

25 Now there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon, and this man was righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit was upon him. And it had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord’s Christ. And inspired by the Spirit he came into the temple; and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him according to the custom of the law, he took him up in his arms and blessed God and said,

29 “Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word; for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared in the presence of all peoples a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and for glory to thy people Israel.”

33 And his father and his mother marveled at what was said about him; and Simeon blessed them and said to Mary his mother, “Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising of many in Israel, and for a sign that is spoken against (and a sword will pierce through your own soul also), that thoughts out of many hearts may be revealed.”

36 And there was a prophetess, Anna, the daughter of Phan’u-el, of the tribe of Asher; she was of a great age, having lived with her husband seven years from her virginity, and as a widow till she was eighty-four. She did not depart from the temple, worshipping with fasting and prayer night and day. And coming up at that very hour she gave thanks to God, and spoke of him to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem.

39 And when they had performed everything according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth. And the child grew and became strong, filled with wisdom; and the favor of God was upon him.

41 Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the Passover. And when he was twelve years old, they went up according to custom; and when the feast was ended, as they were returning, the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem. His parents did not know it, but supposing him to be in the company they went a day’s journey, and when they did not find him, they returned to Jerusalem, seeking him. After three days they found him in the temple, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions; and all who heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers. And when they saw him they were astonished; and his mother said to him, “Son, why have you treated us so? Behold, your father and I have been looking for you anxiously.” And he said to them, “How is it that you sought me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father’s house?” And they did not understand the saying which he spoke to them. And he went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was obedient to them; and his mother kept all these things in her heart.

52 And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man.

3 In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Iturae’a and Trachoni’tis, and Lysa’ni-as tetrarch of Abil’e-ne, in the high-priesthood of Annas and Ca’iphas, the word of God came to John the son of Zechari’ah in the wilderness; and he went into all the region about the Jordan, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet, “The voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every valley shall be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be brought low, and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.”

---

1 Or peace, good will among men

2 Or in the Spirit

3 Or years
7 He said therefore to the multitudes that came out to be baptized by him, “You brood of vipers! Who warned you to feel from the wrath to come? 8 Bear fruits that befit repentance, and do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our father’; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham. 9 Even now the axe is laid to the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.”

10 And the multitudes asked him, “What then shall we do?” 11 And he answered them, “He who has two coats, let him share with him who has none; and he who has food, let him do likewise.” 12 Tax collectors also came to be baptized, and said to him, “Teacher, what shall we do?” 13 And he said to them, “Collect no more than is appointed you.” 14 Soldiers also asked him, “And we, that shall we do?” And he said to them, “Rob no one by violence or by false accusation, and be content with your wages.”

15 As the people were in expectation, and all men questions in their hearts concerning John, whether perhaps he were the Christ, 16 John answered them all, “I baptize you with water; but he who is mightier than I is coming, the thong of whose sandals I am not worthy to untie; he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire. 17 His winnowing fork is in his hand, to clear his threshing floor, and to gather the wheat into his granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire.”

18 So, with many other exhortations, he preached good news to the people. 19 But Herod the tetrarch, who had been reproved by him for Herodias, his brother’s wife, and for all the evil things that Herod had done, 20 added this to them all, that he shut up John in prison.

21 Now when all the people were baptized, and when Jesus also had been baptized and was praying, the heaven was opened, 22 and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form, as a dove, and a voice came from heaven, “Thou art my beloved Son; j with thee I am well pleased.” k

Questions:
1. What does the birth story of Jesus and the story of his baptism tell us about how the early Church saw him and his mission?
2. How is Mary presented in the Gospel According to Luke? What parallels are there between the lives of Mary, mother of Jesus, and Elizabeth, mother of John the Baptist?
5.5 The Letter of Paul to the Romans

Paul (d. c. 87 C.E.) was a Jewish convert to Christianity. He played a central role in preaching the message of the new faith to the Gentiles. In the excerpt included here, Paul declares the relevance of the Gospel to Gentiles and Jews alike and asserts the visible presence of God throughout the world.

Source: The Bible: Revised Standard Version, Chapter 1, p. 169.

1 Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy scriptures, the gospel concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh and designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom we have received grace and apostleship to bring about the obedience of faith for the sake of his name among all the nations, including yourselves who are called to belong to Jesus Christ;

7 To all God’s beloved in Rome, who are called to be saints:
Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

8 First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for all of you, because your faith is proclaimed in all the world. For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I mention you always in my prayers, asking that somehow by God’s will I may now at last succeed in coming to you. For I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift to strengthen you, that is, that we may be mutually encouraged by each other’s faith, both yours and mine. I want you to know, brethren, that I have often intended to come to you (but thus far have been prevented), in order that I may reap some harvest among you as well as among the rest of the Gentiles.

11 I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish: so I am eager to preach the gospel to you also who are in Rome.

16 For I am not ashamed of the gospel: it is the power of God for salvation to every one who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men who by their wickedness suppress the truth. For what can be known about God is plain to them, because God has shown it to them. Ever since the creation of the world his invisible nature, namely, his eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made. So they are without excuse; for although they knew God they did not honor him as God or give thanks to him, but they became futile in their thinking and their senseless minds were darkened. Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles.

24 Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever! Amen.

Question:
1. What can we learn about the character and personality of Paul from this reading?
5.6 Defining the Christian Woman

Women had figured prominently in Jesus’ ministry and life. Paul’s instructions had circumscribed women’s role in the Christian Church, and subsequent male church leaders tended to subordinate and reduce their role even further. Nevertheless, women continued to play an important role in spreading and nurturing the young Christian faith. Augustine, the greatest of all Christian writers (354–430 C.E.), discusses his relationship with his mother Monica and the role she filled in his conversion to the Christian faith.


BOOK III-11

... You sent down your help from above¹ and rescued my soul from the depths of this darkness because my mother, your faithful servant, wept to you for me, shedding more tears for my spiritual death than other mothers shed for the bodily death of a son. For in her faith and in the spirit which she had from you she looked on me as dead. You heard her and did not despise the tears which stream down and watered the earth in every place where she bowed her head in prayer. You heard her, for how else can I explain the dream with which you consoled her, so that she agreed to live with me and eat at the same table in our home? Lately she had refused to do this, because she loathed and shunned the blasphemy of my false beliefs.

She dreamed that she was standing on a wooden rule, and coming towards her in a halo of splendour she saw a young man who smiled at her in joy, although she herself was sad and quite consumed with grief. He asked her the reason for her sorrow and her daily tears, not because he did not know, but because he had something to tell her, for this is what happens in visions. When she replied that her tears were for the soul I had lost, he told her to take heart for, if she looked carefully, she would see that where she was, there also was I. And when she looked, she saw me standing beside her on the same rule.

Where could this dream have come from, unless it was that you listened to the prayer of her heart? For your goodness is almighty; you take good care of each of us as if you had no others in your care, and you look after all as you look after each. And surely it was for the same reason that, when she told me of the dream and I tried to interpret it as a message that she need not despair of being one day such as I was then, she said at once and without hesitation ‘No! He did not say, “Where he is, you are,” but “Where you are, he is.”’

I have often said before and, to the best of my memory, I now declare to you, Lord, that I was much moved by this answer, which you gave me through my mother. She was not disturbed by my interpretation of her dream, plausible though it was, but quickly saw the true meaning, which I had not seen until she spoke. I was more deeply moved by this than by the dream itself, in which the joy for which this devout woman had still so long to wait was foretold so long before to comfort her in the time of her distress. For nearly nine years were yet to come during which I wallowed deep in the mire and the darkness of delusion. Often I tried to lift myself, only to plunge the deeper. Yet all the time this chaste, devout, and prudent woman, a widow such as is close to your heart, never ceased to pray at all hours and to offer you the tears she shed for me. The dream had given new spirit to her hope, but she gave no rest to her sighs and her tears. Her prayers reached your presence² and yet you still left me to twist and turn in the dark.

BOOK VI-1

O God, Hope of my youth,² where were you all this time? Where were you hiding from me? Were you not my Creator and was it not you who made me different from the beasts that walk on the earth and wiser than the birds that fly in the air? Yet I was walking on a treacherous path, in darkness. I was looking for you outside myself and I did not find the God of my own heart. I had reached the depths of the ocean. I had lost all faith and was in despair of finding the truth.

By now my mother had come to me, for her piety had given her strength to follow me over land and sea, facing all perils in the sure faith she had in you. When the ship was in danger, it was she who put heart into the crew, the very men to whom passengers unused to the sea turn for reassurance when they are alarmed. She promised them that they

¹ Many Christian Churches use an adaptation of the Nicene Creed as it was accepted at the Second Council of Constantinople in 381 C.E.
² Psalm 143:7 (144:7)
would make the land in safety, because you had given her this promise in a vision. And she found that I too was in grave
danger because of my despair of discovering the truth. I told her that I was not a Catholic Christian, but at least I was no
longer a Manichee.\(^3\) Yet she did not leap for joy as though this news were unexpected. In fact, to this extent, her anxiety
for me had already been allayed. For in her prayers to you she wept for me as though I were dead, but she also knew that
you would recall me to life. In her heart she offered me to you as though I were laid out on a bier, waiting for you to say
to the widow’s son, ‘Young man, I say to you, stand up.’ And he would get up and begin to speak, and you would give him
back to his mother.\(^4\) So she felt no great surge of joy and her heart beat none the faster when she heard that the tears and
the prayers which she had offered you day after day had at last, in great part, been rewarded. For I had been rescued from
falsehood, even if I had not yet grasped the truth. Instead, because she was sure that if you had promised her all, you would
also give her what remained to be given, she told me quite serenely, with her heart full of faith, that in Christ she believed
that before she left this life she would see me a faithful Catholic. This was what she said to me. But to you, from whom
all mercies spring, she poured out her tears and her prayers all the more fervently, begging you to speed your help and give
me light in my darkness. She hurried all the more eagerly to church, where she listened with rapt attention to all that
Ambrose said. For her his words were like a spring of water within her, that flows continually to bring her everlasting life.\(^5\)
She loved him as God’s angel,\(^6\) because she had learnt that it was through him that I had been led, for the time being, into
a state of wavering uncertainty. She had no doubt that I must pass through this condition, which would lead me from sick-
ness to health....

My heart lies open before you, O Lord my God, and this is what I believe. Because he could show me the way
of salvation she was greatly devoted to Ambrose, and his heart too had warmed to her for her truly pious way of life, her
zeal in good works, and her regular churchgoing. Often, when he saw me, he would break out in praise of her, congratu-
lating me on having such a mother.

Questions:
1. What role did Monica play in the conversion of Augustine to Christianity?
2. From Augustine’s description, what sort of person was Monica?
3. How does your impression of Monica compare with Paul’s injunctions for Christian women in
   Document 3?

\(^3\) A Manichee was considered a heretic by Catholic Christians. Manichees explained evil in the world by believing in an evil god who had created the
world, and that there was a good god who would save one’s soul if one rejected the evil material world including the desires of the flesh.

\(^4\) Luke 7:14, 15.

\(^5\) John 4:14

\(^6\) Galatians 4:14.
5.7 “What Has Jerusalem to do with Athens?”

Tertullian (ca. 160 – ca. 240 C.E.), a native of Carthage, became a strong defender of Christian morals and wrote a series of attacks on heretics. In his *Prescriptions Against Heretics*, he vehemently warns that heresy arises out of a dependence on Greco-Roman philosophy.


... Worldly wisdom culminates in philosophy with its rash interpretation of God’s nature and purpose. It is philosophy that supplies the heresies1 with their equipment.... The idea of a mortal soul was picked up from the Epicureans, and the denial of the restitution of the flesh was taken from the common tradition of the philosophical schools.... Heretics and philosophers [ponder] the same themes and are caught up in the same discussions. What is the origin of evil and why? The origin of man, and how?... A plague on Aristotle, who taught them dialectic [logical argumentation], the art which destroys as much as it builds, which changes its opinions like a coat, forces its conjectures, is stubborn in argument, works hard at being contentious and is a burden even to itself. For it reconiders every point to make sure it never finishes a discussion.

From philosophy come those fables and... fruitless questionings, those “words that creep like doth a canker.” To hold us back from such things, the Apostle [Paul] testifies expressly in his letter to the Colossians [Colossians 2:8] that we should beware of philosophy. “Take heed lest any man [beguile] you through philosophy or vain deceit, after the tradition of men,” against the providence of the Holy Ghost. He had been at Athens where he had come to grips with the human wisdom which attacks and perverts truth, being itself divided up into its own swarm of heresies by the variety of its mutually antagonistic sects. What has Jerusalem to do with Athens, the Church with [Plato’s] Academy, the Christian with the heretic? Our principles come from the Porch of Solomon,2 who had himself taught that the Lord is to be sought in simplicity of heart. I have no use for Stoic or a Platonic or a dialectic Christianity. After Jesus Christ we have no need of speculation, after the Gospel no need of research. When we come to believe, we have no desire to believe anything else; for we begin by believing that there is nothing else which we have to believe.

Question:
1. Why did Tertullian condemn the study of pagan literature and philosophy as dangerous for Christians?
PART 6
The Early Middle Ages

6.1 Portrait of a Visigothic King

Theodoric II reigned over the Visigoths in South Gaul from 453 to 466 C.E. This portrait of him is by a courtly Gallo-Roman bishop who had every reason to flatter this leader of the recent conquerors.


He is a prince well worthy of being known even by those not admitted to his intimate acquaintance, to such a degree have Nature and God, the sovereign Arbiter of all things, accumulated in his person gifts of varied excellence. His character is such that even envy itself, that universal accompaniment of all royalty, could not defraud him of his due praise.

You ask me to describe his daily outdoor life. Accompanied by a very small suite he attends before daybreak the services of the Church in his own household; he is careful in his devotions, but although his tone is suppressed, you may perceive that this is more a matter of habit with him than of religious principle. The business of administration occupies the rest of the morning. An armed aide-de-camp stands beside his throne; his band of fur-clad bodyguards is admitted to the Palace in order that they may be near to the royal presence; while in order that there may not be too much noise, they are kept out of the room; and so they talk in murmurs, inside a railing and outside the hangings [of the hall of audience].

Envoys from foreign powers are then introduced. The King listens much and says little. If their business calls for discussion, he puts it off, if for prompt action, he presses it forward. At eight o’clock he rises, and proceeds to examine either his treasures, or his stables. When he goes to hunt, he does not deem it suitable to the royal dignity to carry his bow upon his own person; when, however, any one points out to him a wild animal or bird, he puts out his hand, and receives his bow unstrung from a page: for, just as he regards it as an undignified thing to carry the weapon in its case, so does he deem it unmanly it should be prepared by another for his use. He selects an arrow and lets fly, first asking what you wish him to strike. You make your choice and invariably he hits the mark; indeed if there is ever any mistake, it is oftener in the sight of him who points out the object than in the aim of him who shoots at it.

His banquets do not differ from those of a private gentleman. You never see the vulgarity of a vast mass of tarnished plate, heaped upon a groaning table by a puffing and perspiring slave. The only thing that is weighty is the conversation: for either serious subjects are discussed, or none at all. Sometimes purple, and sometimes fine silk are employed in adorning the furniture of the dining room. The dinner is recommended by the skill of the cookery, not by the costliness of the provisions—the plate by its brightness, not by its massive weight. The guests are much more frequently called upon to complain of thirst, from finding the goblet too seldom pressed, than to shun inebriety by refusing it. In brief, one sees there the elegance of Greece and promptness of Italy, the splendor of a public along with the personal attention of a private entertainment, likewise the regular order of a royal household. After dinner Theodoric either takes no siesta at all or a very short one. When he feels like it, he picks up the dice quickly, looks at them carefully, shakes them scientifically, throws them at once, jocularly addresses them, and awaits the result with patience. When the cast is a good one he says nothing: when bad, he laughs; good or bad he is never angry, and takes both philosophically.

About three in the afternoon again come the cares of government, back come the suitors, and back those whose duty it is to keep them at a distance. On all sides is heard a wrangling and intriguing crowd, which, prolonged to the royal dinner hour, then only begins to diminish; after that it disperses, every man to seek his own patron. Occasionally, though not often, jesters are admitted to the royal banquet, without, however, being permitted to vent their malicious raillery upon any persons present. When he has risen from table, the guard of the treasury commences its nightly vigil: armed men take their station at all approaches to the palace, whose duty it will be to watch there during the first hours of the night.”

[Despite this eulogy, Theodoric II had climbed to power by the foul murder of his brother, the rightful king.]

Questions:
1. What does this document tell us about the nature of Germanic kingship among the Visigoths?
2. How did Christianity affect that kingship?
3. How does the author’s Christian point of view affect his interpretation of the king and political events?
6.2 **Corpus Juris Civilis: Prologue**

Roman law grew from abstract principles of justice on which the actual rules of law were legislated. The Emperor Justinian ordered a codification of all these laws that had accumulated from the time of the Republic to his own decrees. He issued the Corpus Juris Civilis (Body of Civil Law) in Latin consisting of three parts, the Digest, the Institutes, and a textbook that eventually transmitted Roman legal principles to Western Europe during the twelfth century, influencing church and continental law.

**Source:** From *The Digest of Justinian*, C. H. Monro, ed. (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1904).

**THE DIGEST: PROLOGUE**

*The Emperor Caesar, Flavius, Justinianus, Pious, Fortunate, Renowned, Conqueror, and Triumpher, Ever Augustus, to Tribonianus His Quaestor,.*

*Greeting:*

With the aid of God governing Our Empire which was delivered to Us by His Celestial Majesty, We carry on war successfully. We adorn peace and maintain the Constitution of the State, and have such confidence in the protection of Almighty God that We do not depend upon Our arms, or upon Our soldiers, or upon those who conduct Our Wars, or upon Our own genius, but We solely, place Our reliance upon the providence of the Holy Trinity, from which are derived the elements of the entire world and their disposition throughout the globe.

Therefore, since there is nothing to be found in all things as worthy of attention as the authority of the law, which properly regulates all affairs both divine and human, and expels all injustice; We have found the entire arrangement of the law which has come down to us from the foundation of the City of Rome and the times of Romulus, to be so confused that it is extended to an infinite length and is not within the grasp of human capacity; and hence We were first induced to begin by examining what had been enacted by former most venerated princes, to correct their constitutions, and make them more easily understood; to the end that being included in a single Code, and having had removed all that is superfluous in resemblance and all iniquitous discord, they may afford to all men the ready assistance of true meaning.

After having concluded this work and collected it all in a single volume under Our illustrious name, raising Ourselves above small and comparatively insignificant matters, We have hastened to attempt the most complete and thorough amendment of the entire law, to collect and revise the whole body of Roman jurisprudence, and to assemble in one book the scattered treatises of so many authors which no one else has herebefore ventured to hope for or to expect and it has indeed been considered by Ourselves a most difficult undertaking, nay, one that was almost impossible; but with Our hands raised to heaven and having invoked the Divine aid, We have kept this object in Our mind, confiding in God who can grant the accomplishment of things which are almost desperate, and can Himself carry them into effect by virtue of the greatness of His power.

We desire you to be careful with regard to the following: if you find in the old books anything that is not suitably arranged, superfluous, or incomplete, you must remove all superfluities, supply what is lacking, and present the entire work in regular form, and with as excellent an appearance as possible.

You must also observe the following, namely: if you find anything which the ancients have inserted in their old laws or constitutions that is incorrectly worded, you must correct this, and place it in its proper order, so that it may appear to be true, expressed in the best language, and written in this way in the first place; so that by comparing it with the original text, no one can venture to call in question as defective what you have selected and arranged.

Since by an ancient law, which is styled the Lex Regia, all the rights and power of the Roman people were transferred to the Emperor, We do not derive Our authority from that of other different compilations, but wish that it shall all be entirely Ours, for how can antiquity abrogate our laws?

**Questions:**

1. How can you tell that the Roman Empire is now Christian?
2. Why was the compilation of law undertaken?
3. What were the instructions given to the scholars who codified the Law?
6.3 The Koran

The Koran (Qur’an) means “the recital” and is, according to Islamic belief, the direct words of God as told to his prophet Muhammad through the angel Gabriel. It is the sacred text for Muslims. Excerpts from one of the books, entitled “The Cow,” are reproduced below.


### THE COW

**In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful**

Alif l-‘am m–m. This Book is not to be doubted. It is a guide for the righteous, who have faith in the unseen and are steadfast in prayer; who bestow in charity a part of what We have given them; who trust what has been revealed to you and to others before you, and firmly believe in the life to come. These are rightly guided by their Lord; these shall surely triumph.

As for the unbelievers, it is the same whether or not you forewarn them; they will not have faith. God has set a seal upon their hearts and ears; their sight is dimmed and grievous punishment awaits them.

There are some who declare: ‘We believe in God and the Last Day,’ yet they are no true believers. They seek to deceive God and those who believe in Him: but they deceive none save themselves, though they may not perceive it. There is a sickness in their hearts which God has aggravated: they shall be sternly punished for the lies they told.

Proclaim good tidings to those who have faith and do good works. They shall dwell in gardens watered by running streams: whenever they are given fruit to eat they will say: ‘This is what we used to eat before,’ for they shall be given the like. Wedded to chaste virgins, they shall abide therein for ever.

To Adam We said: ‘Dwell with your wife in Paradise and eat of its fruits to your hearts’ content wherever you will. But never approach this tree or you shall both become transgressors.’

But Satan removed them thence and brought about their banishment. ‘Go hence,’ We said, ‘and be enemies to each other. The earth will for a while provide your dwelling and sustenance.’

Then Adam received commandments from his Lord, and his Lord relented towards him. He is the Forgiving One, the Merciful.

‘Go down hence, all,’ We said. ‘When our guidance is revealed those that accept it shall have nothing to fear or to regret; but those that deny and reject Our revelations shall be the heirs of Hell, and there they shall abide for ever.’

Children of Israel, remember the blessing I have bestowed on you, and that I have exalted you above the nations. Guard yourselves against the day on which no soul shall avail another: when neither intercession nor ransom shall be accepted from it, nor any help be given it.

To Moses We gave the Scriptures and after him We sent other apostles. We gave Jesus the son of Mary veritable signs and strengthened him with the Holy Spirit. Will you then scorn each apostle whose message does not suit your fancies, charging some with imposture and slaying others?

---

1 Cereal grain. What we know as corn originated in the Western Hemisphere.
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And now that a Book confirming their own has come to them from God, they deny it, although they know it to be the truth and have long prayed for help against the unbelievers. God’s curse be upon the infidels! Evil is that for which they have bartered away their souls. To deny God’s own revelation, grudging that He should reveal His bounty to whom He chooses from among His servants! They have incurred God’s most inexorable wrath. An ignominious punishment awaits the unbelievers.

... ...

Say: ‘Whoever is an enemy of Gabriel’ (who has by God’s grace revealed to you the Koran as a guide and joyful tidings for the faithful, confirming previous scriptures) ‘whoever is an enemy of God, His angels, or His apostles, or of Gabriel or Michael, will surely find that God is the enemy of the unbelievers.’

... ...

When his Lord put Abraham to the proof by enjoying on him certain commandments and Abraham fulfilled them, He said: ‘I have appointed you a leader of mankind.’

‘And what of my descendants?’ asked Abraham.

‘My covenant,’ said He, ‘does not apply to the evil-doers.’

We made the House a resort and a sanctuary for mankind, saying: ‘Make the place where Abraham stood a house of worship.’ We enjoined Abraham and Ishmael to cleanse Our House for those who walk round it, who meditate in it, and who kneel and prostrate themselves.

... ...

Who but a foolish man would renounce the faith of Abraham? We chose him in this world, and in the world to come he shall abide among the righteous. When his Lord said to him: ‘Submit,’ he answered: ‘I have submitted to the Lord of the Universe.’

... ...

They say: ‘Accept the Jewish or the Christian faith and you shall be rightly guided.’

Say: ‘By no means! We believe in the faith of Abraham, the upright one. He was no idolater.’

Say: ‘We believe in God and that which is revealed to us; in what was revealed to Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, and the tribes; to Moses and Jesus and the other prophets by their Lord. We make no distinction among any of them, and to God we have surrendered ourselves.’

... ...

Righteousness does not consist in whether you face towards the East or the West. The righteous man is he who believes in God and the Last Day, in the angels and the Book and the prophets; who, though he loves it dearly, gives away his wealth to kinsfolk, to orphans, to the helpless, to the traveller in need and to beggars, and for the redemption of captives; who attends to his prayers and renders the alms levy; who is true to his promises and steadfast in trial and adversity and in times of war. Such are the true believers; such are the God-fearing.

---

2 Muhammad
3 The Ka’bah at Mecca.
Believers, retaliation is decreed for you in bloodshed: a free man for a free man, a slave for a slave, and a female for a female. He who is pardoned by his aggrieved brother shall be prosecuted according to usage and shall pay him a liberal fine. This is a merciful dispensation from your Lord. He that transgresses thereafter shall be sternly punished.

Believers, fasting is decreed for you as it was decreed for those before you; perchance you will guard yourselves against evil. Fast a certain number of days, but if any one among you is ill or on a journey, let him fast a similar number of days later; and for those that cannot endure it there is a ransom: the feeding of a poor man. He that does good of his own accord shall be well rewarded; but to fast is better for you, if you but knew it.

In the month of Ramad-an the Koran was revealed, a book of guidance with proofs of guidance distinguishing right from wrong. Therefore whoever of you is present in that month let him fast. But he who is ill or on a journey shall fast a similar number of days later on.

God desires your well-being, not your discomfort. He desires you to fast the whole month so that you may magnify Him and render thanks to Him for giving you His guidance.

It is now lawful for you to lie with your wives on the night of the fast; they are a comfort to you as you are to them. God knew that you were deceiving yourselves. He has relented towards you and pardoned you. Therefore you may now lie with them and seek what God has ordained for you. Eat and drink until you can tell a white thread from a black one in the light of the coming dawn. Then resume the fast till nightfall and do not approach them, but stay at your prayers in the mosques.

Do not devour one another’s property by unjust means, nor bribe with it the judges in order that you may wrongfully and knowingly usurp the possessions of other men.

Fight for the sake of God those that fight against you, but do not attack them first. God does not love the aggressors. Slay them wherever you find them. Drive them out of the places from which they drove you. Idolatry is worse than carnage. But do not fight them within the precincts of the Holy Mosque unless they attack you there; if they attack you put them to the sword. Thus shall the unbelievers be rewarded: but if they mend their ways, know that God is forgiving and merciful.

Make the pilgrimage and visit the Sacred House for His sake. If you cannot, send such offerings as you can afford and do not shave your heads until the offerings have reached their destination. But if any of you is ill or suffers from an ailment of the head, he must pay a ransom either by fasting or by almsgiving or by offering a sacrifice.

Make the pilgrimage in the appointed months. He that intends to perform it in those months must abstain from sexual intercourse, obscene language, and acrimonious disputes while on pilgrimage. God is aware of whatever good you do. Provide well for yourselves: the best provision is piety. Fear Me, then, you that are endowed with understanding.

It shall be no offence for you to seek the bounty of your Lord.
There are some who say: ‘Lord, give us abundance in this world.’ These shall have no share in the world to come. But there are others who say: ‘Lord, give us what is good both in this world and in the hereafter and keep us from the torment of the Fire.’ These shall have a share, according to what they did. Swift is God’s reckoning.

They ask you about drinking and gambling. Say: ‘There is great harm in both, although they have some benefit for men; but their harm is far greater than their benefit.’

They ask you what they should give in alms. Say: ‘What you can spare.’ Thus God makes plain to you His revelations so that you may reflect upon this world and the hereafter.

They question you concerning orphans. Say: ‘To deal justly with them is best. If you mix their affairs with yours, remember they are your brothers. God knows the just from the unjust. If God pleased, He could afflict you. He is mighty and wise.’

You shall not wed pagan women, unless they embrace the Faith. A believing slave-girl is better than an idolatress, although she may please you. Nor shall you wed idolaters, unless they embrace the Faith. A believing slave is better than an idolater, although he may please you. These call you to Hell-fire; but God calls you, by His will, to Paradise and to forgiveness. He makes plain His revelations to mankind, so that they may take heed.

They ask you about menstruation. Say: ‘It is an indisposition. Keep aloof from women during their menstrual periods and do not touch them until they are clean again. Then have intercourse with them in the way God enjoined you. God loves those that turn to Him in repentance and strive to keep themselves clean.’

Women are your fields: go, then, into your fields whence you please. Do good works and fear God. Bear in mind that you shall meet Him. Give good tidings to the believers.

Those that renounce their wives on oath must wait four months. If they change their minds, God is forgiving and merciful; but if they decide to divorce them, know that God hears all and knows all.

Divorced women must wait, keeping themselves from men, three menstrual courses. It is unlawful for them, if they believe in God and the Last Day, to hide what God has created in their wombs: in which case their husbands would do well to take them back, should they desire reconciliation.

Women shall with justice have rights similar to those exercised against them, although men have a status above women. God is almighty and wise.

Divorce may be pronounced twice, and then a woman must be retained in honour or allowed to go with kindness. It is unlawful for husbands to take from them anything they have given them, unless both fear that they may not be able to keep within the bounds set by God; in which case it shall be no offence for either of them if the wife ransom herself.

Mothers shall give such to their children for two whole years if the father wishes the sucking to be completed. They must be maintained and clothed in a reasonable manner by the child’s father. None should be charged with more than one can bear. A mother should not be allowed to suffer on account of her child, nor should a father on account of his child. The same duties devolve upon the father’s heir. But if, after consultation, they choose by mutual consent to wean the child, they shall incur no guilt. Nor shall it be any offence for you if you prefer to have a nurse for your children, provided that you pay her what you promise, according to usage. Have fear of God and know that God is cognizant of all your actions.

Widows shall wait, keeping themselves apart from men for four months and ten days after their husbands’ death. When they have reached the end of their waiting period, it shall be no offence for you to let them do whatever they choose for themselves, provided that it is decent. God is cognizant of all your actions.

---

4 Revocable divorce, or the renunciation of one’s wife on oath.
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You shall bequeath your widows a year’s maintenance without causing them to leave their homes; but if they leave of their own accord, no blame shall be attached to you for any course they may deem fit to pursue. God is mighty and wise. Reasonable provision shall also be made for divorced women. That is incumbent on righteous men.

There shall be no compulsion in religion. True guidance is now distinct from error. He that renounces idol-worship and puts his faith in God shall grasp a firm handle that will never break. God hears all and knows all. God is the Patron of the faithful. He leads them from darkness to the light. As for the unbelievers, their patrons are false gods, who lead them from light to darkness. They are the heirs of Hell and shall abide in it for ever.

Satan threatens you with poverty and orders you to commit what is indecent. But God promises you His forgiveness and His bounty. God is munificent and all-knowing.

He gives wisdom to whom He will; and he that receives the gift of wisdom is rich indeed. Yet none except men of sense bear this in mind.

Whatever alms you give and whatever vows you make are known to God. The evil-doers shall have none to help them.

To be charitable in public is good, but to give alms to the poor in private is better and will atone for some of your sins. God has knowledge of all your actions.

It is not for you to guide them. God gives guidance to whom He will.

Whatever alms you give shall rebound to your own advantage, provided that you give them for the love of God. And whatever alms you give shall be paid back to you in full: you shall not be wronged.

Those that live on usury shall rise up before God like men whom Satan has demented by his touch; for they claim that trading is no different from usury. But God has permitted trading and made usury unlawful. He that has received an admonition from his Lord and mended his ways may keep his previous gains; God will be his judge. Those that turn back shall be the inmates of the Fire, wherein they shall abide for ever.

God has laid His curse on usury and blessed almsgiving with increase. God bears no love for the impious and the sinful.

Believers, when you contract a debt for a fixed period, put it in writing. Let a scribe write it down for you with fairness; no scribe should refuse to write as God has taught him.
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Call in two male witnesses from among you, but if two men cannot be found, then one man and two women whom you judge fit to act as witnesses; so that if either of them commit an error, the other will remember. Witnesses must not refuse to give evidence if called upon to do so...

\[ \ldots \]

‘This is more just in the sight of God; it ensures accuracy in testifying and is the best way to remove all doubt. But if the transaction in hand be a bargain concluded on the spot, it is no offence for you if you do not commit it to writing.

See that witnesses are present when you barter with one another, and let no harm be done to either scribe or witness.

Questions:
1. According to the Koran, what are the relations between Muslims and the Jews and Christians?
2. What are the requirements of the believers? What if one does not follow them? Are there exceptions?
3. In what ways does the Koran provide guidelines in the realm of society, economics, and politics?
4. What does the Koran say about fighting against unbelievers, often called Jihad (holy wars)?
5. How are women and relations between men and women treated in the Koran?
This description of Baghdad is by an unknown Persian nobleman (perhaps a student at the university in Baghdad) in a letter to his father, written during the reign of Haroun al-Rashid (786–809). The nobleman is describing the city only fifty years after it was built to be the capital of the Abbasid Caliphate. The city was built as a walled fortress town with the caliphate's residence in the center of town behind its own ninety foot wall and moat. As can be seen by this description, it quickly became a prosperous town at the center of Islamic trade, with a population close to one million (this is less than the number cited in the document, but numbers tend to be exaggerated in such documents).


**THE BAGHDAD OF HAROUN AL-RASHID**

When I wandered about in the city after a long absence, I found it in an expansion of prosperity that I had not observed before this time. The resplendent buildings that rose in the city... were not sufficient for its wealthy people until they extended to the houses in this eastern quarter known as Rusafa. They built high castles and ornamented houses in this quarter, and set up markets, mosques, and public baths. The attention of al-Rashid... was directed toward adorning it with public buildings, until the old Baghdad became like an ancient town whose beauties were assembled in a section of the city which was created near by it.

I admired the arrival of buildings in Baghdad because of the over crowdedness of the people I had seen in its sections. Their billowing is like the sea in its expanses; their number is said to exceed 1,500,000, and no other city in the world has such a sum or even half its amount....

It is difficult for me, with this pen which is of limited substance, to describe the glorious qualities of the city which are but a small part of the honor it achieves, such that it prides itself in the splendor of power.... The people of wealth walk with slave boys and and retinue whose number the listener will fancy to be far from the truth. I witnessed at Attabiyya station a prince who was riding with a hundred horsemen and was surrounded by slave boys, even filling the road and blocking the path of the people until they passed... Nor was any Caliph ever known to be more generous than he (Haroun al-Rashid) in the handing out of wealth. It is said that he spends ten thousand dirhams (a silver coin) every day for his food, and perhaps the cooks would prepare for him thirty kinds of food. Abu Yusuf informed me that when the Caliph consummated his marriage to Zubaida, the daughter of Ja’far the Barmakid, he gave a banquet unprecedented in Islam. He gave away unlimited presents at this banquet, even giving containers of gold filled with silver, containers of silver filled with gold, bags of musk, and pieces of ambergris. The total expenditure on this banquet reached 55,000,000 dirhams. The Caliph commanded that Zubaida be presented in a gown of pearls whose price no one was able to appraise. He adorned her with pieces of jewelry, so much so that she was not able to walk because of the great number of jewels which were upon her. This example of extravagance had no precedent among the kings of Persia, the emperors of Byzantium, or the princes of the Umayyads, despite the great amounts of money which they had at their disposal....

Affluence is abundant among the upper rank of those who are masters of the state. It then diminishes little by little among those of lesser rank, until only a small amount remains for the general public. As for those who do not enjoy the exalted power and breadth of bounty of the kings, they begin to equip themselves with all the good things after they have gone on journeys which gain them experience, show them wondrous things, and give them profits. The people in the provinces come to them with the grandest of all types of their wares, until markets have become plentiful in Baghdad. They have advanced from requesting necessities to the acquisition of things for beautification and decoration. This may be seen in the case of their purchase of arms inlaid with gold, their competing in costly jewels, ornamented vessels, and splendid furniture, and their acquisition of a large number of slave boys, female singers, and those things which they send out their retainers to seek in the provinces. When every expensive and rare thing in the country was brought to them, I realized that the beauties of the world had been assembled in Baghdad....

**Questions:**

1. How would you characterize Baghdad based on this description? Consider wealth, social classes/occupations, kinds of goods available.
2. Why do you think the city is so prosperous only fifty years after its creation?
3. What does the description of the caliph reveal about the time, the city, the religion, social practices, etc?
6.5 A Christian’s Description of the Mongols

The Europeans came in contact with the Mongols while they were fighting the Muslims in the Crusades in the thirteenth century. In 1245, Pope Innocent IV sent a Christian missionary to the Mongols to try to convince them not to attack Europe and to convert to Christianity (See Chapter 10, Document 1 for the Pope’s bull and the Mongol leader’s response). The Missionary provided the following description of the Mongols.


These men, that is to say the Tartars, are more obedient to their masters than any other men in the world, be they religious or seculars; they show great respect to them nor do they lightly lie to them. They rarely or never contend with each other in word, and in action never. Fights, brawls, wounding, murder are never met with among them. Nor are robbers and thieves who steal on a large scale found there; consequently their dwellings and the carts in which they keep their valuables are not secured by bolts and bars. If any animals are lost, whoever comes across them either leaves them alone or takes them to men appointed for this purpose; the owners of the animals apply for them to these men and they get them back without any difficulty. They show considerable respect to each other and are very friendly together, and they willingly share their food with each other, although there is little enough of it. They are also long-suffering. When they are without food, eating nothing at all for one or two days, they do not easily show impatience, but they sing and make merry as if they had eaten well. On horseback they endure great cold and they also put up with excessive heat. Nor are they men fond of luxury; they are not envious of each other; there is practically no litigation among them. No one scorns another but helps him and promotes his good as far as circumstances permit.

Their women are chaste, nor does one hear any mention among them of any shameful behavior on their part; some of them, however, in jest make use of vile and disgusting language. Discord among them seems to arise rarely or never, and although they may get very drunk, yet in their intoxication they never come to words or blows.

Now that the good characteristics of the Tartars have been described, it is time for something to be said about their bad. They are most arrogant to other people and look down on all, indeed they consider them as nought, be they of high rank or low born....

They are quickly roused to anger with other people and are of an impatient nature; they also tell lies to others and practically no truth is to be found among them. At first indeed they are smooth-tongued, but in the end they sting like a scorpion. They are full of slyness and deceit, and if they can, they get round everyone by their cunning. They are men who are dirty in the way they take food and drink and do other things. Any evil they intend to do to others they conceal in a wonderful way so that the latter can take no precautions nor devise anything to offset their cunning. Drunkenness is considered an honorable thing by them and when anyone drinks too much, he is sick there and then, nor does this prevent him from drinking again. They are exceedingly grasping and avaricious; they are extremely exacting in their demands, most tenacious in holding on to what they have and most niggardly in giving. They consider the slaughter of other people as nothing. In short, it is impossible to put down in writing all their evil characteristics on account of the very great number of them.

Their food consists of everything that can be eaten, for they eat dogs, wolves, foxes, and horses and, when driven by necessity, they feed on human flesh. For instance, when they were fighting against a city of the Kitayans, where the emperor was residing, they besieged it for so long that they themselves completely ran out of supplies and, since they had nothing at all to eat, they thereupon took out one of every ten men for food. They eat the filth which comes from mares when they bring forth foals. Nay, I have even seen them eating lice. They would say, “Why should I not eat them since they eat the flesh of my son and drink his blood?” I have also seen them eat mice.

They do not use tablecloths or napkins. They have neither bread nor herbs nor vegetables nor anything else, nothing but meat, of which, however, they eat so little that other people would scarcely be able to exist on it. They make their hands very dirty with the grease of the meat, but when they eat they wipe them on their leggings or the grass or some other such thing. It is the custom for the more respectable among them to have small bits of cloth with which to wipe their hands at the end when they eat meat. One of them cuts the morsels and another takes them on the point of a knife and offers them to each, to some more, to some less, according to whether they wish to show them greater or less honor. They do not wash their dishes, and, if occasionally they rinse them with the meat broth, they put it back with the meat into the pot. Pots also or spoons or other articles intended for this use, if they are cleaned at all, are washed in the same manner. They consider
it a great sin if any food or drink is allowed to be wasted in any way; consequently they do not allow bones to be given to dogs until the marrow has been extracted. They do not wash their clothes nor allow them to be washed, especially from the time when thunderstorms begin until the weather changes. They drink mare’s milk in very great quantities if they have it; they also drink the milk of ewes, cows, goats and even camels. They do not have wine, ale, or mead unless it is sent or given to them by other nations. In the winter, moreover, unless they are wealthy, they do not have mare’s milk. They boil millet in water and make it so thin that they cannot eat it but have to drink it. Each one of them drinks one or two cups in the morning and they eat nothing more during the day; in the evening, however, they are all given a little meat, and they drink the meat broth. But in the summer, seeing they have plenty of mare’s milk, they seldom eat meat, unless it happens to be given to them or they catch some animal or bird when hunting.

They also have a law or custom of putting to death any man and woman they find openly committing adultery; similarly if a virgin commits fornication with anyone, they kill both the man and the woman. If any is found in the act of plundering or stealing in the territory under their power, he is put to death without any mercy. Again, if anyone reveals their plans, especially when they intend going to war, he is given a hundred stripes on his back, as heavy as a peasant can give with a big stick. If any of the lower class offend in any way, they are not spared by their superiors, but are soundly beaten. There is no distinction between the son of a concubine and the son of a wife, but the father gives to each what he will; and if they are of a family of princes, then the son of a concubine is a prince just the same as the son of a legitimate wife. When a Tartar has many wives, each one has her own dwelling and her household, and the husband eats and drinks and sleeps one day with one, and the next with another. One, however, is chief among the others and with her he stays more often than with the others. In spite of their numbers, they never easily quarrel among themselves.

The men do not make anything at all, with the exception of arrows, and they also sometimes tend the flocks, but they hunt and practice archery, for they are all, big and little, excellent archers, and their children begin as soon as they are two or three years old to ride and manage horses and to gallop on them, and they are given bows to suit their stature and are taught to shoot; they are extremely agile and also intrepid.

Young girls and women ride and gallop on horseback with agility like the men. We even saw them carrying bows and arrows. Both the men and the women are able to endure long stretches of riding. They have very short stirrups; they look after their horses very well, indeed they take the very greatest care of all their possessions. Their women make everything, leather garments, tunics, shoes, leggings, and everything made of leather; they also drive the carts and repair them, they load the camels, and in all their tasks they are very swift and energetic. All the women wear breeches and some of them shoot like the men.

Questions:
1. What characteristics does the European missionary use to describe the Mongols?
2. Given the way he describes the Mongols, how might he perceive the Europeans to be?
3. Based on this description, what do we learn about the culture of the Mongols? Is there room for misunderstanding or misrepresentation on the part of the missionary? Note that cannibalism was a common attribute Europeans gave to non-Europeans.
6.6 Contracts between Lords and Vassals

Every vassal in medieval society concluded a contract of mutual obligations with his lord who granted him possession of a fief, an estate in land. Vassals often held many fiefs, with conflicting obligations to various lords. Such overlapping jurisdictions, created by the custom of vassals making their own grants of fiefs to others (a process called subinfeudation), could and did cause conflict and warfare in Europe during the Middle Ages. Here are three records of such contractual agreements: the grant of a fief by King Louis VII of France to the Bishop of Beauvais in 1167, a grant by the Count of Troyes to Jocelyn d’Avalon in 1200, and a contract of 1221 between the Countess of Nevers and her lord, Philip II, King of France.


GRANT OF A FIEF, 1167 C.E.

In the name of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, Amen. I, Louis, by the grace of God, king of the French, make known to all present as well as to come, that at Mante in our presence, Count Henry of Champagne conceded the fief of Savigny to Bartholomew, bishop of Beauvais, and his successors. And for that fief the said bishop has made promise and engagement for one knight and justice and service to Count Henry; and he has also agreed that the bishops who shall come after him will do likewise. In order that this may be understood and known to posterity we have caused the present charter to be corroborated by our seal; done at Mante, in the year of the Incarnation Word 1167; present in our palace those whose names and seals are appended: seal of count Thiebault, our steward; seal of Guy, the butler; seal of Matthew, the chamberlain; seal of Ralph, the constable. Given by the hand of Hugh, the chancellor.

GRANT OF A FIEF, 1200 C.E.

I, Thiebault, count palantine of Troyes, make known to those present and to come that I have given in fee to Jocelyn d’Avalon and his heirs the manor which is called Gillencourt, which is of the castellanerie of La Ferte sur Aube; and whatever the same Jocelyn shall be able to acquire in the same manor I have granted to him arid his heirs in augmentation of that fief. I have granted, moreover, to him that in no free manor of mine will I retain men who are of this gift. The same Jocelyn, moreover, on account of this has become my liege man, saving, however, his allegiance to Gerard d’Arcy, and to the lord duke of Burgundy, and to Peter, count of Auxerre. Done at Chouaude, by my own witness, in the year of the Incarnation of our Lord 1200, in the month of January. Given by the hand of Walter, my chancellor.

AUTHORITY OF A LORD OVER TITLE MARRIAGE OF VASSALS, 1221 C.E.

Eventually women were allowed to hold and inherit fiefs. Because military service was a major obligation of the vassal, a lord would be concerned about whom the heiress married.

I, Matilda, countess of Nevers make known to all who see this present letter, that I have sworn upon the sacred gospels to my dearest lord, Philip, by the grace of God, the illustrious king of France, that I will do to him good and faithful service against all living men and women, and that I will not marry except by his will and grace. For keeping these agreements firmly I have given pledges to the same lord king from my men whom I had with me, on their oaths, in this wise, that if I should fail to keep the said agreements with the lord king, (though this shall not be), these are held to come to the lord king with all their lands and fiefs which are held from me, and shall take their oaths to him against me until it shall have been made good to him to his satisfaction. And whenever the lord king shall ask me I will cause him to have similar oaths from my men who were not present with me before the lord king, that is to say from all whom I may have, in good faith, and without evil intention, and similarly the fealty of my town. And in order that this may remain firm and stable, I have written the present letters supported by my seal. Given at Melun, in the year of the Lord 1221, in the month of February.

Questions:
1. What are the obligations that each document requires of the parties involved?
2. In what ways did granting a fief to a member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy involve that spiritual vassal in secular politics and create the possibility of a conflict of loyalties?
3. When a man held fiefs from different lords, how did the feudal system resolve questions of divided loyalty and service?
4. Why would or could a lord reasonably demand the right to consent to the marriage of heiresses to the fief?
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6.7 The Book of Emperors and Kings, Charlemagne and Pope Leo III

In this excerpt from _The Book of Emperors and Kings_ the author describes the early years of Charlemagne's kingship and the development of his relationship with Pope Leo III. The narrative culminates in the Pope's consecration of Charlemagne as Emperor in 800. Whether the events described really happened or not, the document sheds light on early medieval ideas about kingship, the papacy, and the relationship between secular and religious authorities.


The Empire remained without a head. The lords of Rome set the crown on Saint Peter's Altar. Meeting all together, they swore before the people that never again would they choose a king—nor judge, nor anyone else to rule them—from the kin of the preceding house, which had proven unable to maintain faith and honor with them. They wanted kings from other lands.

According to a custom of those days, young princes from all over the Empire were raised and instructed with great care at the court in Rome. The Romans gave them the sword of knighthood when the time came..., sending the young heirs back to their homelands. This helped keep all the dominions mindful of serving Rome.

It came to pass that Pippin, a mighty king of Karlingen, had two fine sons. One of them named Leo came to hold Saint Peter’s throne after being raised in Rome, while Charles, the other, stayed home.

One night when Charles fell asleep, a voice called out to him three times: “Arise, beloved Charles, and hurry to Rome! Your brother Leo needs you!” And quickly Charles made ready, saying nothing to anyone about what he intended to do until he asked leave of the King to go....

When the young Prince asked for leave, his father granted it to him gladly and bestowed gifts upon his son in a manner worthy of a mighty king....

Charles really undertook his journey more for [the chance to pray at the tombs of] the divine Apostles than for his brother’s sake. Early and late in the day his thoughts, which he revealed to no one, were filled with love of God....

When Charles arrived in Rome, he was given a fine reception by old and young.... Pope Leo sang a mass then in honor of the Holy Ghost and to strengthen the Prince’s spirit. Then he received God’s Body. All who were there praised God, finding Charles so worthy and to their liking that the law should make him their ruler.

Charles did not listen to what was being said: He had made his journey for the sake of prayer, and he let no commotion distract him. He entered churches barefoot and, imploring God’s mercy, he prayed for his soul. This steadfast devotion brought him every worldly honor, too....

Thus he spent four weeks so wrapped in prayer and meditation that no one could approach him to speak, until once his brother, Pope Leo, and all the people fell at his feet. Charles pointed out to God in Heaven that if he were to prove unworthy he never should have made his journey. Then he received the royal emblems, and they set a magnificent crown on his head. All those there in Rome rejoiced that day, and all said, “Amen.”

Then the King sat in judgment, and the Pope made complaint before him that church properties and the collection of tithes, entrusted to him by his predecessors for his use in the saving of souls, were being granted away from his jurisdiction, and that his benefices had been taken from him. His complaint angered a number of the nobles.

Then Charles spoke these true ruler’s words: “Never in this world, I feel sure, did anyone make a gift to honor God in order that another might take it. That would clearly be robbery.... Whoever would take anything away from gifts bestowed on God’s houses, through which God’s work is furthered, would be despised of God and could not remain a good Christian....” Then those nobles departed, full of resentment. Charles also had no desire to remain there any longer.

Charles returned to Ripuaria. The Romans realized very well that he was their rightful judge, but stupid men among them ridiculed the others for ever having proclaimed him ruler.... In Saint Peter’s Cathedral they caught the Pope and pushed his eyes out of their sockets...., and sent him blind to the King in Ripuaria.

---

1 “Karlingen,” the name given by several medieval German writers to the domain of Charlemagne and his ancestors, is probably a derivation by analogy on the assumption that the name of the great Charles (Karl) was given to his whole family domain. Similarly, his grandson Lothar’s name was applied to Lorraine (Lotharingen).

2 Territorial home of one historic group of the Franks on the Rhine River; for the author, this location is sometimes synonymous with “Karlingen,” sometimes one of its provinces.
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Nothing remained for the Pope to do but set out on the journey in his hapless condition. He rode on a donkey and took with him two of his chaplains, desiring no other escort.

The Pope arrived in Ingelheim with his two chaplains and rode into the King’s courtyard. When the King saw him coming, he said to one of his men: “Someone has attacked this pilgrim, and we shall do justice in his cause if we can. He seems badly injured. Someone must have robbed him.

The King strode quickly across the courtyard and said: “Good pilgrim, if you wish to stay here with me, I will gladly take you in. Tell me if your misfortune is such that I can help you with it. Why don’t you dismount?”

The noble Pope wanted to draw closer to the King. His head hung at a strange angle, and his eyes stared askew. “That God should have granted me your presence!” he began. . . . “It has not been long since I sang a mass for you at Rome, when I could still see.” As he spoke these words, the noble King recognized him and was so shocked that he could neither see nor hear. . . . His body went limp and he could not speak.

When the Emperor had recovered, the Pope told him sorrowfully: “I have come here that you may take pity on me. It was because of you that I lost my eyes: they blinded me to get even with you. Still, Brother, you must pull yourself together, and weep no more.

The Emperor himself lifted him down and carried him across the courtyard into his private chamber. There they sat together, and Charles told his men to go outside. “Brother,” he said, “how did this happen to you? Let me hear your complaint, and then my forces of justice will right the wrong.”

Pope Leo answered the King: “Brother, after you left Rome, the Romans very soon betrayed their loyalty to me in a conspiracy. They caught me in the Cathedral and committed this terrible crime upon me. Brother, we must bear this patiently: I seek vengeance only in Heaven, and you must not injure any of them for this.”

“It would be doing God a dishonor to spare those murderers!” the noble King replied. “Ah! How sorely that would injure Christendom. I am called ‘Judge’ and ‘Ruler’; and this means I have the duty of judging over the peoples. . . . I must defend Christendom with the sword. You will have them sorely regret their crime against you. I will avenge your eyes, or I will renounce my sword.”

Then he dispatched messengers to King Pippin to tell him of his great need and let the nobles of Karlingen know that if they ever wanted to render God a loving service they should hurry to him. And there were none in Karlingen but who proclaimed all with one voice: “Woe to the fatal hour that Rome was ever founded!”

The messengers galloped ceaselessly from land to land and from lord to vassal: all men were willing to come to the cause of Charles. Farmers and merchants, too—no one could hold them back. They left all their belongings and set out to join Charles. The mourning and grief over the news traveled through Christendom from people to people, and the streams of warriors converged like clouds over the Great Saint Bernard Pass. . . . The book does not give a number for the total army, but it was the greatest military expedition that ever descended on Rome.

When the army had advanced to within sight of the Aventine Hill in Rome, the worthy King asked three days and nights for himself. This annoyed his great lords, who went to him to say that it ill became his office to pause there, now that they had come so close that they could see the city which had aggrieved them.

“First we must pray to God, for we must gain His leave to carry through,” answered the King. “Then we shall fight with ease.”

Early one morning the voice of God spoke to him: “God in Heaven commands you, King, to remain here no longer. Ride on to Rome: God has rendered judgment, and just vengeance shall overtake them.”

And so the King’s banner was raised, and Charles let word pass through his whole army that when the knights were prepared for battle they should keep their eyes upon the banner and ride in close formation. Hearts swelling with high spirits, Charles’s men swarmed over the hill.

Owî, what an army this was that besieged Rome and the Lateran for seven days and seven nights, so menacingly that no one would fight against it! On the eighth day—this is the truth I am telling you—the Romans ordered the city gates opened and offered to let the King enter with this condition: that any man who could prove himself innocent of committing, aiding, or advising the crime would remain in the King’s favor, while the King would deal with the guilty ones after deciding on a just sentence.

As the Emperor sat in judgment and the document naming the guilty men was read, the accused all fervently denied their guilt when they were called forward. The King ordered them to submit to trial by combat for their unwillingness to confess. But then the Romans objected that this was not according to their law, and that no Emperor had ever forced such treatment on them before; instead, they should prove their innocence by swearing with their two fingers.
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Then King Charles spoke: “I doubt that any crime so great was ever committed before. Don’t be overhasty now: I imagine my brother saw at the time who did it.” Still, when so very many of the accused offered their oaths in the Cathedral, the King said: I will not deprive you of recourse to your own law any longer; however, I know of a youth here named Pancras. If you are willing to swear an oath at his grave and if he tolerates it, then I will be willing to believe you.”

Icy fear seized the Romans at the mention of this test. As they came to the place sacred to Saint Pancras and were supposed to hold up their fingers and to keep asserting their innocence under oath, one man was overcome, and panic gripped all the rest. They retreated in fear and fled back over the bridge although a fair number went back to Saint Peter’s Cathedral.

Charles hesitated no longer but rode after them angrily. For three days, he and his men struck them down, and for three days they carried them out. Then they washed down the floor stones. . . . Charles fell on his knees before Saint Peter’s tomb and made his plea to Christ: “Lord God in Heaven, how can I be any good to You as King when You let such shame befall me? Sinner that I may be, I do make every attempt to judge the people in a manner worthy of You. The Romans swore allegiance to a Pope, and You granted him a portion of Your power that he might loose the people from their sins and bind them. I [ask] . . . that you give the evil people of Rome something to recognize Your hidden power by: then they will know for certain that You are a true God. Grant me this, Holy Christ!”

A second time Charles, the noble King, fell to the ground and said: “Hail noble Saint Peter! You are really a divine stalwart of God, a watchman of Christendom. Think now, my lord, what I am going through! You are a summoner of the Kingdom of Heaven. Just look at your Pope! I left him sound of body in your care. Blinded was how I found him, and if you do not heal the blind man today I shall destroy your Cathedral and ruin the buildings and grounds donated to you, and then I shall leave him for you blind as he is, and go back again to Ripuaria.”

Quickly the noble Pope Leo made himself ready and said his confession. As he spoke the last word, he saw a heavenly light with both his eyes. Great are hidden powers of God.

The Pope turned around and spoke to the multitude: “My dearest children gathered from afar, be glad of heart, for the Kingdom of God is drawing near to you. God has heard you and because of your holy prayer has turned His face toward you. Here, at this very place, you are called to be public witnesses that a great miracle has happened. . . . I can see with both eyes better than I ever saw in this world.”

The Pope consecrated him as Emperor and granted absolution to all his comrades in arms. Owi, what joy there was in Rome then! The whole people rejoiced then and sang: “Gloria in excelsis Deo.”

Then Charles laid down the Imperial Law, as an angel recited the true words of God to him. . . . And so the mighty Emperor left us many good laws, which God caused to be spoken before him. . . .

The very first laws the Emperor established dealt with what seemed to him to be the most exalted matters, those concerning bishops and priests, for the Imperial Law of Constantine had been sadly neglected. At the same time, he established laws governing tithes and gifts of property to the Church. . . .

Now I shall tell you about what the peasant is to wear according to the Imperial Law: his clothes may be black or gray, and he is allowed no other. . . . He is to have shoes of cow leather only and seven yards of towcloth for his shirt and breeches. He is to spend six days at the plow and doing plenty of other work; on Sunday he is to go to Church, carrying his animal goad openly in his hand. If a sword is found on a peasant, he is to be led bound to the churchyard fence, where he is to be tied and his skin and hair are to be flayed. If he is threatened by enemies, however, let him defend himself with a pitchfork. This law King Charles established for his peasants. . . .

Emperor Charles besieged a walled city called Arles [France], which actually took him more than seven years. The inhabitants had considered him unworthy of his office. By way of an underground canal, wine was conveyed to them in plentiful supply, but finally Charles’s cunning succeeded in cutting off their source. When the inhabitants could not hold out any longer, they threw open the city gates and fought fiercely, offering no terms at all. So many were slain on both sides that there is no man who can tell another how many of either the Christians or the heathens were lying there dead after the battle. No one could tell the dead apart until the Emperor solved the problem with God’s help: He found the Christians lying separately in well adorned coffins. Now that is a wonder really worth telling about. . . .

The Emperor and his men turned toward Galicia [in Spain], where the king of the heathens inflicted great losses upon them. The Christian soldiers were all slain, and Charles barely escaped from the battle. Today the stone stays wet on which Charles sat afterwards, weeping passionately as he lamented his sins, saying: “Hail to You, God sublime! Grant me mercy for my poor soul. Take me out of this world, so that my people will no longer be punished because of me. I can never be consoled again.”
Then an angel comforted him, saying: “Charles, beloved of God, your joy will come to you quickly. Bid your messengers make haste to summon virgin women—leave the married ones at home—for God will reveal His power through them. If you will fear and love God, the maidens will win your honor back again for you.”

The messengers made haste and thoroughly searched through all the lands. They gathered together the maidens and brought them together . . . where the Emperor was waiting for them. Many a young maid came to join the host, fifty-three thousand—I am telling you this as a fact—and sixty-six more . . . .

When all the maidens arrived in a valley since named for Charles, they readied themselves for battle in formations just like men. . . .

Each heathen sentry was struck by wonder as to who this people could be, for it all seemed very strange to them. They hurried back, and one of them said to their king: “Sire, even though we slew the old ones, we must tell you for a fact that the young ones have followed them here. I have the feeling they want to slake their thirst for vengeance. They are big around the chest. Sire, if you fight with them, it will not come to any good end. Their hair is long, and their gait is very graceful. They are fine knights indeed. They are a terrifying lot . . . . No force could ever be assembled on this earth to defeat them . . . .”

At the advice of his experienced counsellors, their king turned over hostages to the Emperor. The king then had himself baptized—how well he suddenly believed in God!—and all his people with him . . . . Thus God made Charles victorious without the thrust of a spear or the blow of a sword, and the maidens well realized that God in Heaven was with them.

Charles and his heroines returned to their own homes back in the Empire. On the way, the worthy maidens came to a green meadow. Tired from the expedition, the heroines stuck their spearshafts into the ground and stretched out their arms in the form of a cross, sleeping on the ground after praising God for the goodness which He had shown them. They stayed there overnight, and a great miracle occurred. Their spearshafts had turned green and had sent forth leaves and blossoms. That is why the place is called “Woods of the Spearshafts”; it can be seen to this day.

Charles, the rich and powerful, built a mighty and beautiful church for the praise of Holy Christ, the honor of Saint Mary and all God’s maidens, and the solace of Christendom. Since through chastity and spiritual purity the maids achieved their victory, the church is called Domini Sanctitas.³

Questions:
1. How does the author establish Charlemagne as a model Christian ruler?
2. What motivates the Romans to attack the Pope? Why is Charlemagne ultimately to blame for this conflict?
3. Why is the pope’s requesting mercy for his assailants unacceptable to Charlemagne?
4. Does The Book of Emperors and Kings give any justification for identifying most of the inhabitants of Arles as “heathens”?
5. How does Charlemagne finally win his struggle in Spain?

³ This church is the Emperor’s Chapel, the main and oldest part of the Aachen Cathedral, also called Saint Mary’s.
6.8 St. Patrick’s Confession

St. Patrick (ca. 389-461 C.E.) was the son of a Christian Briton family who was seized in a raid by the Irish and taken back to their island as a slave. Escaping, he entered a monastery on the Continent and was ordained a missionary to Ireland in 432. Although there were some Irish Christians in the south before Patrick's mission, it is largely through his thirty years of missionary activity in Ireland that Christianity became established and systemized there. He left a Confession that includes a brief account of his life, of personal spiritual struggles, and of missionary activity.


PART I

I, Patrick, a sinner, very rustic, and the least of all the faithful, and very contemptible in the estimation of most men, had as father a certain man called Calpornius, a deacon, son of Potitus, a presbyter, who was in the town Bannaventa Berniae, for he had a little villa nearby, where I conceded capture. In years I was then almost sixteen. For I was ignorant of the true God, and I was led to Ireland in captivity with so many thousands of men according to our deserts, because we withdrew from God, and we did not keep watch over His precepts, and we were not obedient to our priests, who kept admonishing our salvation, and the Lord led down over us the wrath of His anger and dispersed us among many gentiles even as far as the furthest part of land, where now my insignificance is seen to be among members of a strange race. And there the Lord opened the consciousness of my unbelief so that, perhaps, late, I might remember my delicts, and that I might turn with a whole heart to the Lord my God, Who turned His gaze round on my lowliness and took pity on my adolescence and ignorance and kept watch over me before I knew Him and before I was wise or distinguished between good and bad, and He fortified me and consoled me as a father [consoles] a son.

...  ...

As an adolescent, more precisely, as an almost wordless boy, I conceded capture before I knew what I ought to seek or what to avoid. Whence therefore today I blush for shame and vehemently thoroughly fear to strip naked my unlearnedness, because I cannot unfold in speech to those learned in conciseness as, however, my spirit and mind longs, and the emotion of my consciousness suggests. But if, consequently, it had been given to me just as also to others, even so I would not be silent on account of what should be handed back [from me to God]. And if by chance it seems to certain men that I put myself forward in this, with my lack of knowledge and my rather slow tongue, but even so it is, however, written, “Stammering tongues will swiftly learn to speak peace.” How much more ought we to seek, we who are, he affirms, The letter of Christ for salvation as far as the furthest part of land, and if not learned, yet valid and very vigorous, written in your hearts not with ink but by the Spirit of the living God, and again the Spirit testifies even rustic work created by the Most High. Whence I, the extreme rustic, a refugee, untaught, doubtless, who do not know how to look forward into the future, but that I do know most certainly, that indeed before I was humbled. I was like a stone that lies in deep mud, and He Who is powerful came and in His pity He raised me up and assuredly to be sure lifted me upward and placed me on the highest wall and therefore I ought forcefully to shout out for something that should be handed back to the Lord also for His benefits so great here and for eternity, which [benefits] the mind of men cannot estimate. Whence, moreover, be astonished, consequently, you great and small who fear God, and you, sirs [lords], clever rhetoricians hear therefore and examine who roused me up, a fool, from the midst of those who seem to be wise and learned by experience in law and powerful in speech and in everything and inspired me, assuredly, beyond the others of this execrable world..., in order even after my death to leave behind a legacy to my brothers and Sons whom I have baptized in the Lord, so many thousands of men....
PART II

But after I had come to Ireland, I was consequently pasturing domestic animals daily, and often in the day I was praying. More and more the love of God and fear of Him was approaching, and faith was being increased, and the Spirit was being stirred up, so that in a single day up to a hundred prayers, and in a night nearly the same, even as I was staying in forests and on the mountain, and before dawn I was roused up to prayer, through snow, through frost, through rain, and I was feeling nothing bad, nor was there any sloth in me, as I see now, because the Spirit was being fervent in me then, and there, to be sure, on a certain night in a dream I heard a voice saying to me, “It is well that you are fasting, bound soon to go to your fatherland.” And again after a very little time I heard the answer saying to me, “Look, your ship is ready.” And it was not near, but perhaps two hundred miles and I had never been there, nor did I have any single acquaintance among men there, and then later I turned to flight, and I abandoned the man with whom I had been for six years, and I came in the power of God. Who was directing my way toward the good, and I was fearing nothing until I came through to that ship, and on that day on which I came through the ship set out from its own place, and I spoke as I had the wherewithal to ship with them, and the captain, it displeased him, and he responded sharply with indignation, “By no means will you seek to go with us.”

And when I heard these things I separated myself from them, so that I would come to the little hut where I was staying, and on the journey I began to pray, and before I could bring the prayer to the highest perfection I heard one of them, and he was shouting out vigorously after me, “Come soon, because these men are calling you”, and immediately I returned to them, and they began to say to me, “Come, because we are receiving you on faith, make friendship with us in whatever way you will have wished” and on that day, to be sure, I refused to suck their nipples on account of the fear of God, but nevertheless I hoped to come by them to the faith of Jesus Christ, as they were gentiles, and because of this I got my way with them, and we shipped at once.

And after a three-day period we reached land, and for twenty-eight days we made a journey through the desert, and food was not forthcoming for them, and hunger prevailed over them, and on the next day the captain began to say to me, “What is it, Christian? You say your God is great and all-powerful. Why therefore can you not pray for us, because we are imperilled by hunger, for it is not likely that we may ever see any man.”

But I said confidently to them, “Be turned in faith with a whole heart to the Lord my God, because nothing is impossible to Him, so that today He may dispatch food to you until you should be satisfied on your way, as there was abundance everywhere for Him.” And with God helping it was made so.

Look, a flock of pigs appeared in the way before our eyes, and they killed many of them, and there they remained two nights and were well fed, and they were refilled with their flesh, because many of them fainted away, and were left behind half-alive along the way, and after this they gave the highest thanks to God, and I was made honourable in their eyes, and from this day they had food abundantly; they even discovered [lit. ‘came upon’] forest honey, and they offered a part to me, and one of them said, “It is a [pagan] sacrifice.” Thanks be to God, I tasted nothing from it.

And again after a few years in the Britains I was with my parents, who received me as a son, and in faith requested me whether now I, after such great tribulations which I bore, I should not ever depart from them. And there to be sure I saw in a vision of the night a man coming as if from Ireland, whose name [was] Victoricius, with innumerable epistles, and he gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of the epistle containing ‘the Voice of the Irish’, and while I was reciting the beginning of the epistle I kept imagining hearing at that very moment the voice of those very men who were beside the Forest of Foclut, which is near the Western Sea [lit. ‘the sea of the setting (sc. of the sun)’], and thus they shouted out as if from one mouth, “We request you, holy boy, that you come and walk farther among us.” And I was especially stabbed at heart, and I could not read further. And thus I have learned by experience, thanks be to God, that after very many years the Lord has supplied them according to their clamour.
Look, again and again briefly I will set out the words of my Confession.

I bear testimony in truth and in exultation of heart before God and His holy angels that I have never had any occasion besides the Gospel and His promises that I should ever go back to that gentile people whence earlier I had barely escaped.

But I beseech those believing and fearing God, whoever will have deigned to look on or receive this writing, which Patrick, a sinner, untaught, to be sure, wrote down in Ireland, that no man should ever say that by my ignorance, if I have accomplished or demonstrated any small thing according to the acceptable purpose of God, but that you judge and it must be most truly believed that it was the gift of God, and this is my Confession before I die.

Questions:
1. What were Patrick's first experiences in Ireland and how did he escape?
2. What problems did Patrick have to overcome to become a Christian missionary?
3. What is his own evaluation of his life and work?
7.1 Gregory VII’s Letter to the Bishop of Metz, 1081

Gregory VII (pope 1073–1085) was one of the great medieval popes. An advocate of reform and a strengthened papacy, Gregory came into conflict with many of Europe’s secular rulers, chief among them the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV (1050–1106). In the letter included here, Gregory argued for the primacy of the pope over kings and other secular authorities.


Bishop Gregory, servant of the servants of God, to his beloved brother in Christ, Hermann bishop of Metz, greeting and apostolic benediction. It is doubtless owing to a dispensation of God that, as we learn, thou art ready to endure trials and dangers in defence of the truth. For such is His ineffable grace and wonderful mercy that He never allows His chosen ones completely to go astray—never permits them utterly to fall or to be cast down. For, after they have been afflicted by a period of persecution—a useful term of probation as it were,—He makes them, even if they have been for a time faint-hearted, stronger than before. Since, moreover, manly courage impels one strong man to act more bravely than another and to press forward more boldly—even as among cowards fear induces one to flee more disgracefully than another,—we wish, beloved, with the voice of exhortation, to impress this upon thee: thou shouldst the more delight to stand in the army of the Christian faith among the first, the more thou art convinced that the conquerors are the most worthy and the nearest to God. Thy request, indeed, to be aided, as it were, by our writings and fortified against the madness of those who babble forth with impious tongue that the authority of the holy and apostolic see had no authority to excommunicate Henry—a man who despises the Christian law; a destroyer of the churches and of the empire; a patron and companion of heretics—or to absolve any one from the oath of fealty to him, seems to us to be hardly necessary when so many and such absolutely decisive warrants are to be found in the pages of Holy Scripture. Nor do we believe, indeed, that those who (heaping up for themselves damnation) impudently detract from the truth and contradict it have added these assertions to the audacity of their defence so much from ignorance as from a certain madness.

For, to cite a few passages from among many, who does not know the words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ who says in the gospel: ‘Thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in Heaven’? [Matthew xvi. 18, 19.] Are kings excepted here? Or are they not included among the sheep which the Son of God committed to St Peter? Who, I ask, in view of this universal concession of the power of binding and loosing, can think that he is withdrawn from the authority of St Peter, unless, perhaps, that unhappy man who is unwilling to bear the yoke of the Lord and subjects himself to the burden of the devil, refusing to be among the number of Christ’s sheep? It will help him little to his wretched liberty that he shake from his proud neck the divinely granted power of Peter. For the more any one, through pride, refuses to bear it, the more heavily shall it press upon him unto damnation at the judgement.

The holy fathers, as well in general councils as in their writings and doings, have called the Holy Roman Church the universal mother, accepting and serving with great veneration this institution founded by the divine will, this pledge of a dispensation to the church, this privilege entrusted in the beginning and confirmed to St Peter the chief of the apostles. And even as they accepted its statements in confirmation of their faith and of the doctrines of holy religion, so also they received its judgements—consenting in this, and agreeing as it were with one spirit and one voice: that all greater matters and exceptional cases, and judgements over all churches, ought to be referred to it as to a mother and a head; that from it there was no appeal; that no one should or could retract or reverse its decisions. . . .
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... Shall not an authority founded by laymen—even by those who do not know God,—be subject to that authority which the providence of God Almighty has for His own honour established and in His mercy given to the world? For His Son, even as He is undoubtingly believed to be God and man, so is He considered the highest priest, the head of all priests, sitting on the right hand of the Father and always interceding for us. Yet He despised a secular kingdom, which makes the sons of this world swell with pride, and came of His own will to the priesthood of the cross. Who does not know that kings and leaders are sprung from men who were ignorant of God, who by pride, robbery, perfidy, murders—in a word, by almost every crime at the prompting of the devil, who is the prince of this world—have striven with blind cupidity and intolerable presumption to dominate over their equals, that is, over mankind? To whom, indeed, can we better compare them, when they seek to make the priests of God bend to their feet, than to him who is head over all the sons of pride1 and who, tempting the Highest Pontiff Himself, the Head of the kings, the Son of the Most High, and promising to Him all the kingdoms of the world, said: ‘All these I will give unto Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me’?2 who can doubt but that the priests of Christ are to be considered the fathers and masters of kings and princes and of all the faithful? Is it not clearly pitiful madness for a son to attempt to subject to himself his father, a pupil his master; and for one to bring into his power and bind with iniquitous bonds him by whom he believes that he himself can be bound and loosed not only on earth but also in Heaven? This the emperor Constantine the Great, lord of all the kings and princes of nearly the whole world, plainly understood—as the blessed Gregory reminds us in a letter to the emperor Maurice, when, sitting last after all the bishops, in the holy council of Nicaea, he presumed to give no sentence of judgement over them, but addressed them as gods and decreed that they should not be subject to his judgement but that he should be dependent upon their will. 

... Many pontiffs have excommunicated kings or emperors. For, if particular examples of such princes is needed, the blessed pope Innocent excommunicated the emperor Arcadius for consenting that St John Chrysostom should be expelled from his see. Likewise another Roman pontiff, Zacchary, deposed a king of the Franks, not so much for his iniquities as because he was not fitted to exercise so great power. And in his stead he set up Pepin, father of the emperor Charles the Great, in his place—releasing all the Franks from the oath of fealty which they had sworn him. As, indeed, the holy church frequently does by its authority when it absolves servitors from the fetters of an oath sworn to such bishops as, by apostolic sentence, are deposed from their pontifical rank. And the blessed Ambrose—who, although a saint, was still not bishop over the whole church—excommunicated and excluded from the church the emperor Theodosius the Great for a fault3 which, by other priests, was not regarded as very grave. He shows, too, in his writings that gold does not so much because he was not fitted to exercise so great power. And in his stead he set up Pepin, father of the emperor Charles the Great, in his place—releasing all the Franks from the oath of fealty which they had sworn him. As, indeed, the holy church frequently does by its authority when it absolves servitors from the fetters of an oath sworn to such bishops as, by apostolic sentence, are deposed from their pontifical rank. And the blessed Ambrose—who, although a saint, was still not bishop over the whole church—excommunicated and excluded from the church the emperor Theodosius the Great for a fault3 which, by other priests, was not regarded as very grave. He shows, too, in his writings that gold does not so much

Furthermore every Christian king, when he comes to die, seeks as a pitiful suppliant the aid of a priest, that he may escape hell’s prison, may pass from the darkness into the light, and at the judgement of God may appear absolved from the bondage of his sins. Who, in his last hour (what layman, not to speak of priests), has ever implored the aid of an earthly king for the salvation of his soul? And what king or emperor is able, by reason of the office he holds, to rescue a Christian from the power of the devil through holy baptism, to number him among the sons of God, and to fortify him with the divine unction? Who of them can by his own words make the body and blood of our Lord,—the greatest act in the Christian religion? Or who of them possesses the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth? From all of these considerations it is clear how greatly the priestly office excels in power.

Who of them can ordain a single clerk in the holy Church, much less depose him for any fault? For in the orders of the Church a greater power is needed to depose than to ordain. Bishops may ordain other bishops, but can by no means depose them without the authority of the apostolic see. Who, therefore, of even moderate understanding, can hesitate to give priests the precedence over kings? Then, if kings are to be judged by priests for their sins, by whom can they be judged with better right than by the Roman pontiff?

In short, any good Christians may far more properly be considered kings than may bad princes. For the former, seeking the glory of God, strictly govern themselves, whereas the latter, seeking the things which are their own and not the things of God, are enemies to themselves and tyrannical oppressors of others. Faithful Christians are the body of the true king, Christ; evil rulers, that of the devil. The former rule themselves in the hope that they will eternally reign with the
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1 Job xli. 34.
2 Matt. iv. 9.
3 A savage massacre in Thessalonica, 390, as a reprisal for a riot.
Supreme Emperor, but the sway of the latter ends in their destruction and eternal damnation with the prince of darkness, who is king over all the sons of pride.

It is certainly not strange that wicked bishops are of one mind with a bad king, whom they love and fear for the honours which they have wrongfully obtained from him. Such men simoniacally ordain whom they please and sell God even for a paltry sum. As even the elect are indissolubly united with their Head, so also the wicked are inescapably leagued with him who is the head of evil, their chief purpose being to resist the good. But surely we ought not so much to denounce them as to mourn for them with tears and lamentations, beseeching God Almighty to snatch them from the snares of Satan in which they are held captive, and after their peril to bring them at last to a knowledge of the truth.

We refer to those kings and emperors who, too much puffed up by worldly glory, rule not for God but for themselves. Now, since it belongs to our office to admonish and encourage every one according to the rank or dignity which he enjoys, we endeavour, by God’s grace, to arm emperors and kings and other princes with the weapon of humility, that they may be able to allay the waves of the sea and the floods of pride. For we know that earthly glory and the cares of this world usually tempt men to pride, especially those in authority. So that they neglect humility and seek their own glory, desiring to lord it over their brethren. Therefore it is of especial advantage for emperors and kings, when their minds tend to be puffed up and to delight in their own glory, to discover a way of humbling themselves, and to realize that what causes their complacency is the thing which should be feared above all else. Let them, therefore, diligently consider how perilous and how much to be feared is the royal or imperial dignity. For very few are saved of those who enjoy it; and those who, through the mercy of God, do come to salvation are not so glorified in the Holy Church by the judgement of the Holy Spirit as are many poor people. For, from the beginning of the world until our own times, in the whole of authentic history we do not find seven emperors or kings whose lives were as distinguished for religion and so adorned by miracles of power as those of an innumerable multitude who despised the world—although we believe many of them to have found mercy in the presence of God Almighty. For what emperor or king was ever so distinguished by miracles as were St Martin, St Antony and St Benedict—not to mention the apostles and martyrs? And what emperor or king raised the dead, cleansed lepers, or healed the blind? See how the Holy Church praises and venerates the Emperor Constantine of blessed memory, Theodosius and Honorius, Charles and Louis as lovers of justice, promoters of the Christian religion, defenders of the churches: it does not, however, declare them to have been resplendent with such glorious miracles. Moreover, to how many kings or emperors has the holy church ordered chapels or altars to be dedicated, or masses to be celebrated in their honour? Let kings and other princes fear lest the more they rejoice at being placed over other men in this life, the more they will be subjected to eternal fires. For of them it is written: ‘The powerful shall powerfully suffer torments.’ And they are about to render account to God for as many men as they have had subjects under their dominion. But if it be no little task for any private religious man to guard his own soul: how much labour will there be for those who are rulers over many thousands of souls? Moreover, if the judgement of the Holy Church severely punishes a sinner for the slaying of one man, what will become of those who, for the sake of worldly glory, hand over many thousands to death? And such persons, although after having slain many they often say with their lips ‘I have sinned,’ nevertheless rejoice in their hearts at the extension of their (so-called) fame. They do not regret what they have done. Nor are they grieved at having sent their brethren down to Tartarus. As long as they do not repent with their whole heart, nor agree to give up what they have acquired or kept through bloodshed, their repentance remains without the true fruit of penitence before God.

Therefore they should greatly fear and often call to mind what we have said above, that out of the innumerable host of kings in all countries from the beginning of the world, very few are found to have been holy; whereas in one single see—the Roman—of the successive bishops from the time of blessed Peter the Apostle, nearly one hundred are counted amongst the most holy. And why is this, unless because kings and princes, enticed by vain glory, prefer, as has been said, their own things to things spiritual, whereas the bishops of the Church, despising vain glory, prefer God’s will to earthly things? The former are quick to punish offences against themselves, but lightly tolerate those who sin against God. The latter readily pardon those who sin against themselves, but do not readily forgive offenders against God. The former, too bent on earthly achievements, think little of spiritual ones; the latter, earnestly meditating on heavenly, things, despise the things of earth. . . .

Therefore let those whom Holy Church, of its own will and after proper counsel, not for transitory glory but for the salvation of many, calls to have rule or dominion, humbly obey. And let them always beware in that point as to which St Gregory in that same pastoral book bears witness: ‘Indeed, when a man disdains to be like to men, he is made like to an apostate angel. Thus Saul, after having possessed the merit of humility, came to be swollen with pride when at the
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5 Psalm xciii. 4.
6 Wisdom vi. 6. Greek, ‘Mighty men shall be searched out mightily.’
7 Reg. Past. II. vi.
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summit of power. Through humility, indeed, he was advanced; through pride, rejected—God being witness who said: “When thou wast small in thine own eyes, did I not make thee head over the tribes of Israel?”8 And a little further on: ‘Moreover, strange to say, when he was small in his own eyes he was great in the eyes of God; but when he seemed great his own eyes he was small in the eyes of God.’ Let them also carefully retain what God says in the gospel: ‘I seek not my own glory’; and, ‘He who will be the first among you shall be the servant of all.’9 Let them always prefer the honour of God to their own; let them cherish and guard justice by observing the rights of every man; let them not walk in the counsel of the ungodly but, with an assenting heart, always consort with good men. Let them not seek to subject to themselves or to subjugate the Holy Church as a handmaid; but above all let them strive, by recognizing the teachers and fathers, to render due honour to the eyes of the Church—the priests of God. For if we are ordered to honour our fathers and mothers after the flesh—how much more our spiritual ones! And if he who has cursed his father or mother after the flesh is to be punished with death—what does he merit who curses his spiritual father or mother? Let them not, led astray by worldly love, strive to place one of their own sons over the flock for which Christ poured forth His blood, if they can find some one who is better and more useful than he: lest, loving their son more than God, they inflict the greatest damage on the Holy Church. For he who neglects to provide to the best of his ability for such a want—and, one might say, necessity—of Holy Mother Church is openly convicted of not loving God and his neighbour as a Christian should.

For if this virtue, love, has been neglected, no matter what good any one does he shall be without any fruit of salvation. And so by humbly doing these things, and by observing the love of God and of their neighbour as they ought, they may hope for the mercy of Him who said: ‘Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly of heart.’10 If they have humbly imitated Him they shall pass from this servile and transitory kingdom to a true kingdom of liberty and eternity.

Question:
1. Why is Papal authority so important to Gregory and the Church? Could he have compromised?

8 1 Sam. xv. 17.
9 Jn. viii, 50, Matt. xx. 27.
10 Matt. xi. 29.
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7.2 Benedict of Nursia: The Rule of St. Benedict

Benedict of Nursia (d. c. 547) played a key role in shaping the development of monasticism in the West. In 529, Benedict founded the monastery at Monte Casino in central Italy. The Rule of St. Benedict would become the model for life in many future monastic communities.


I. Of the Kinds of Monks.

II. Of the Character of the Abbot.

III. Of calling the Brethren to Counsel.— Whenever matters of importances have to be dealt with in the monastery, let the abbot summon the whole congregation and himself put forward the question that has arisen. Then, after hearing the advice of the brethren let him think it over by himself and do what he shall judge most advantageous. Now we have said that all should be summoned to take counsel for this reason, that it is often to the younger that the Lord reveals what is best. But let the brethren give advice with all subjection of humility, so as not to presume obstinately to defend their own opinions; rather let the matter depend on the abbot’s judgement, so that all should submit to whatever he decide to be best. Yet, just as it becomes the disciples to obey their master, so it behoves him to order all things with prudence and justice.

And in all things let all follow the Rule as their guide: and let no one diverge from it without good reason. Let no one in the monastery follow his own inclinations, and let no one boldly presume to dispute with his abbot, whether within or without the monastery. If anyone so presume, let him be subject to the discipline of the Rule. The abbot, for his part, should do everything in the fear of the Lord and in observance of the Rule; knowing that he will surely have to give account to God for all his decisions, as to a most impartial judge. If it happen that matters of less moment have to be dealt with, let him avail himself of the advice of the seniors only; as it is written: ‘Do all things with counsel, and thou shalt not thereafter repent’ [Ecclus. xxii. 19.]

VIII. Of the Divine Office at Night.—In the winter time, that is from the First of November until Easter, according to what is reasonable, they must rise at the eighth hour of the night, so that they rest a little more than half the night, and rise when they have had their full sleep. But let the time that remains after vigils be spent in study by those brothers who have still to learn any part of the psalter or lessons. From Easter, moreover, until the aforesaid First of November, let the hour of keeping vigils be so arranged that, after a short interval, in which the brethren may go out for the necessities of nature, lauds, which are always to be said at break of day, may follow immediately.

XVI. How Divine Office shall be said in the Daytime.—As the prophet says: ‘Seven times in the day do I praise Thee.’ This sacred number seven will thus be fulfilled by us if, at lauds, at the first, third, sixth, ninth hours, at vesper time and at ‘completorium’ we perform the duties of our service; for it is of these hours of the day that he said: ‘Seven times in the day do I praise Thee’ [Ps. cxix. 164]. For, concerning the night hours, the same prophet says: ‘At midnight I arose to confess unto thee’ [ibid. 62]. Therefore, at these times, let us give thanks to our Creator concerning the judgements of his righteousness: that is, at matins, etc.... and at night we will rise and confess to him....

XX. Of Reverence in Prayer.—When we make application to men in high positions we do not presume to do so without reverence and humility; how much more, then, are we bound to entreat God, the Lord of all, with all humility and devout purity of heart. And we must recognize that we are heard not for our much speaking, but for our purity of heart and tears of contrition. Therefore our prayer must be brief and pure—unless it chance to be prolonged with the inspiration of God’s grace. When we assemble together, let the prayer be quite brief; and let us all rise together, when the Prior gives the signal.

XXI. Of the Deans of the Monastery.—If the congregation be a larger one, let there be chosen from it brothers of good reputation and of godly life; and let them be made deans. And they shall be watchful over their deaneries in all things, according to the commands of God and the precepts of their abbot. And the deans elected shall be such that the abbot may with confidence share his burdens with them. And they shall not be elected according to seniority, but according to the merit of their life and their learning and wisdom. And, should any one of these deans be found to be blame-worthy, being puffed up by pride; and if, after being admonished once and again and a third time, he be unwilling to amend—let him be deposed; and let another, who is worthy, be chosen in his place.
XXII. How the Monks are to sleep.—Let them sleep in separate beds, and let their beds be suitable to their manner of life, as the Abbot shall appoint. If possible, let them all sleep in one room. But if there be too many for this, let them take their rest in groups of 10 or 20, with seniors in charge of each group. Let a candle be kept burning in the cell until morning. Let them sleep clothed, girdled with belts or cords—but without knives at their sides, lest they injure themselves in sleep. And thus let the monks be always ready; and, when the signal is given, let them rise without delay and rival one another in their haste to the service of God, yet with all reverence and modesty.

Let not the younger brothers have beds by themselves, but dispersed among the seniors. And when they rise for the service of God let them gently encourage one another, because the sleepy ones are apt to make excuses.

XXIII. Of Excommunication for Faults.—If a brother be found contumacious or disobedient, proud or a grumbler, or in any way acting contrary to the holy Rule and despising the orders of his seniors, let him, according to the Lord’s commandment, be privately admonished once and twice by his seniors. If he do not then amend, let him be publicly rebuked before all. But if even then he do not correct himself, let him be subjected to excommunication, if he understands the gravity of this penalty. If, however, he is incorrigible, let him undergo corporal chastisement.

XXIV. Of the Extent of Excommunication.—The extent of the excommunication or discipline is to be regulated according to the gravity of the fault; and this is to be decided by the abbot’s discretion. If a brother be found guilty of a lighter fault, he shall be excluded from the common table; he shall also intone neither psalm nor antiphon in the oratory, or read a lesson, until he has atoned. He shall take his meals alone, after those of the brethren; if, for example, the brethren have their meal at the sixth hour, he shall have his at the ninth. . . .

XXV. Of Grave Faults.—The brother who is held guilty of a graver fault shall be suspended both from table and from the oratory. None of the brothers may in any way consort with him, or have speech with him. He shall be alone at the labour enjoined upon him, and continue in the sorrow of penitence; knowing that terrible sentence of the Apostle who said that such a man was given over to the destruction of the flesh in order that his soul might be saved at the day of the Lord [1 Cor. v. 5]. His portion of food he shall take alone, in the measure and at the time that the abbot shall appoint as suitable for him. Nor shall he be blessed by any one who passes by, nor the food that is given him.

XXVI. Of those who, without being ordered by the Abbot, consort with the Excommunicated.—If any brother presume, without an order of the abbot, in any way to associate with an excommunicated brother, or to speak with him, or to give an order to him: he shall suffer the same penalty of excommunication.

XXVII. What care the Abbot should exercise with regard to the Excommunicated.—The abbot shall show the utmost solicitude and care towards brothers that offend: ‘They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick [Matt. ix. 12]. And therefore he ought to use every means, as a wise physician; to send ‘playmates,’ i.e. older and wiser brothers, who, as it were secretly, shall console the wavering brother and lead him to the atonement of humility. And they shall comfort him lest he be overwhelmed by excess of sorrow. But rather, as the same apostle says [2 Cor. ii. 8], charity shall be confirmed in him, and he shall be prayed for by all. For the abbot should employ the utmost solicitude, and take care with all prudence and diligence, lest he lose any of the sheep entrusted to him. For he should know that he has undertaken the care of weak souls, not the tyranny over the strong. And he shall fear the threat of the prophet through whom the Lord says: ‘Ye did take that which ye saw to be strong, and that which was weak ye did cast out’ [? cf. Ezek. xxxiv]. And let him imitate the pious example of the good Shepherd, who, leaving the ninety and nine sheep upon the mountains, went out to seek the one sheep that had gone astray: and He had such compassion upon its infirmity, that He deigned to place it upon His sacred shoulders, and thus to carry it back to the flock.

XXVIII. Of those who, being often rebuked, do not amend.—If any brother, having frequently been rebuked for any fault, do not amend even after he has been excommunicated, a more severe chastisement shall fall upon him; that is, the punishment of the lash shall be inflicted upon him. But if he do not even then amend; or, if perchance (which God forbid) puffed up with pride he try even to defend his deeds: then the abbot shall act as a wise physician. If he have applied the fomentations, the ointments of exhortation, the medicaments of the Divine Scriptures; if he have proceeded to the last cauterization of excommunication, or flogging, and if he see that his efforts avail nothing: let him also (what is more powerful) call in the prayer of himself and all the brothers for him: that God who can do all things may work a cure upon a sick brother. But if he be not healed, even in this way, then at last the abbot may use the surgeon’s knife, as the apostle says: ‘Remove evil from, you’ [1 Cor. v. 13], lest one diseased sheep contaminate the whole flock.

XXIX. Whether Brothers who leave the Monastery ought again to be received.—A brother who goes out, or is cast out, of the monastery for his own fault, if he wish to return, shall first promise every amends for the fault on account of which he departed; and thus he shall be received into the lowest degree—so that thereby his humility may be proved. But if he again depart, up to the third time he shall be received. Knowing that after this every opportunity of return is denied to him.
XXX. Concerning Boys under Age, how they shall be corrected.—Every age or intelligence ought to have its proper bounds. Therefore as often as boys or youths, or those who are less able to understand how great is the punishment of excommunication; as often as such persons offend, they shall either be punished with extra fasts, or coerced with severe blows, that they may be healed.

XXXIII. Whether the Monks should have anything of their own.—More than any thing else is this vice of property to be cut off root and branch from the monastery. Let no one presume to give or receive anything without the leave of the abbot, or to retain anything as his own. He should have nothing at all: neither a book, nor tablets, nor a pen—nothing at all. For indeed it is not allowed to the monks to have bodies or wills in their own power. But for all things necessary they must look to the Father of the monastery; nor is it allowable to have anything which the abbot has not given or permitted. All things shall be common to all, as it is written: ‘Let not any man presume or call anything his own’ [Acts iv. 32]. But if any one is found delighting in this most evil vice: being warned once and again, if he do not amend, let him be subjected to punishment.

XXXIV. Whether all ought to receive Necessaries equally.—As it is written: ‘It was divided among them singly, according as each had need’ [Acts iv. 35]: whereby we do not say—far from it—that there should be respect of persons, but a consideration for infirmities. Wherefore he who needs less, let him thank God and not be grieved; but he who needs more, let him be humiliated on account of his weakness, and not made proud on account of the indulgence that is shown him. And thus all members will be in peace. Above all, let not the evil of grumbling appear, on any account, by the least word or sign whatever. But, if such a grumbler is discovered, he shall be subjected to stricter discipline.

XXXV. Of the Weekly Officers of the Kitchen.—The brothers shall wait on each other in turn that no one shall be excused from the kitchen-work, unless he be prevented by sickness, or by preoccupation with some matter of great necessity whereby is gained a greater reward and increase of charity.... An hour before each meal the weekly servers are to receive a cup of drink and a piece of bread over and above their ration, so that they may wait on their brethren without grumbling or undue fatigue. But on solemn days they shall fast till after Mass. etc.

XXXVI. Of the Sick Brethren.—Before all things, and above all things, care must be taken of the sick; so that the brethren shall minister to them as they would to Christ himself; for he said: ‘I was sick and ye visited me’ [Matt. xxv. 36], and ‘Inasmuch as, etc.’ [ibid. 40]. But let the sick, on their part, remember that they are being cared for to the honour of God; and let them not by their abundance offend the brothers who serve them: which (offences) nevertheless are patiently to be borne, for, from such, a greater reward is acquired. Wherefore let the abbot take the greatest care that they suffer no neglect. And for these infirm brothers a cell shall be set apart, and a servitor, God-fearing, and diligent and careful. The use of baths shall be offered to the sick as often as is necessary: to the healthy, and especially to youths, more rarely. The eating of meat also shall be allowed to the sick, and to the delicate, to assist their recovery. But when they have grown better, they shall all, in the usual manner, abstain from flesh. The abbot, moreover, shall take the greatest care that the sick be not neglected by the cellarer or by the servitors: for whatever fault is committed by the disciples recoils upon him.

XXXVII. Of the Old and Young.—Although human nature itself is prone to have consideration for these ages—that is, old age and infancy,—nevertheless the authority of the Rule also should provide for them. Their weakness shall always be taken into account, and in the matter of food, the strict tenor of the Rule shall by no means be observed, as far as they are concerned; but they shall be treated with kind consideration, and may anticipate the regular (canonical) hours [sc. of meals].

XXXVIII. Of the Weekly Reader.—At the meal times of the brothers there should always be reading; no one may dare to take up the book at random and begin to read there; but he who is about to read for the whole week shall begin his duties on Sunday. And, entering upon his office after Mass and Communion, he shall ask all to pray for him, that God may avert from him the spirit of elation. And this verse shall be said in the oratory three times by all, he however beginning it: ‘O Lord, open Thou my lips, and my mouth shall show forth Thy praise.’ And thus, having received the benediction, he shall enter upon his duties as reader. And there shall be the greatest silence at table, so that no whispering or any voice save the reader’s may be heard. And whatever is needed, in the way of food, the brethren should pass to each other in turn, so that no one need ask for anything. But if anything should be wanted let them ask for it by means of a sign rather than by speech. . .

XXXIX. Of the Amount of Food.—We think it sufficient for the daily meal, either at the sixth or the ninth hour, that there be, at all seasons, two cooked dishes. And this because of the weaknesses of different people, so that he who happens not to be able to eat of one may make his meal of the other. Let two dishes, then, suffice for the brethren: or if fruits or fresh vegetables are obtainable, a third may be added. Let one pound of bread suffice for a day, whether there be one principal meal, or both dinner and supper. If there is to be supper, the cellarer must keep back a third of the pound, to be given out at supper. But if unusually heavy work has been done it shall be in the discretion and power of the abbot to make some addition; avoiding excess, above all things, that no monk be overtaken by indigestion. . . All must abstain from the flesh of four-footed beasts, except the delicate and the sick.
XL. Of the Amount of Drink.—Each one has his own gift from God, the one in this way, the other in that [I Cor. ix. 17]. Therefore it is with some hesitation that the amount of daily sustenance for others is fixed by us. Nevertheless, in view of the weakness of the infirm we believe that one pint of wine a day is enough for each one. Let those to whom God gives the ability to endure abstinence know that they will have their reward. But the prior shall judge if either the nature of the locality or labour, or the heat of summer, requires more; taking care in all things lest satiety or drunkenness creep in. Indeed we read that wine is not suitable for monks at all. But because, in our day, it is not possible to persuade the monks of this, let us agree at least as to the fact that we should not drink to excess, but sparingly. For wine can make even the wise to go astray. Where, moreover, owing to local conditions, the amount aforesaid cannot be provided,—but much less or nothing at all—those who live there shall bless God and shall not grumble. And we admonish them as to this above all: that they be without grumbling.

XLII. At what Hours the Brothers ought to take their Refection.—From the holy Easter time until Pentecost the brothers shall have their refection at the sixth hour; and at evening they shall sup. From Pentecost, moreover, through the whole summer—unless the monks have hard labour in the fields, or the extreme heat of the summer oppress them—they shall fast on Wednesday and Friday until the ninth hour: but on the other days they shall have their meal at the sixth hour. Which sixth hour, if they have ordinary work in the fields, or if the heat of summer is not great, shall be kept to for the meal; and it shall be for the abbot to decide. And he shall so arrange all things, that their souls may be saved on the one hand; and that, on the other, what the brothers do they shall do without any justifiable grumbling. Moreover, from the 13th of September to the beginning of Lent they shall have their meal at the ninth hour. But during Lent they shall have the meal in the evening, at such time as enables them to finish in daylight.

XLIII. Of Silence after Compline.—Monks should practise silence at all times, but especially in the hours of night. Therefore on all days, whether fasting days or otherwise, let them sit together as soon as they have risen from supper (if it be not a fast day) and let one of them read the ‘Collations’ ['Selections'] or ‘Lives of the Fathers,’ or something, else which may edify the hearers. But not the Heptateuch, or ‘Kings’; for it will not profit weak intellects to listen to that part of Scripture at that hour; but they may be read at other times. . . . At the end of the reading . . . let them say Compline [Completorium] and when that is over, let no one be allowed to speak to anyone. If anyone be found breaking this law of silence he shall undergo severe punishments. Unless the presence of guests should require speech, or the abbot should chance to drink, sleep, chatter, and mirth; and let him look forward to holy Easter with the joy of spiritual longing. And let each
announce his offering to the abbot that it may be done with his prayers and with his approval. For whatever is done without the leave of the spiritual father is to be set down to presumption and pride, and not to the credit of a monk.

L. Of those who work away from the Monastery, or those on a Journey. [They must observe the Hours.]

LI. Of those who go on Short Journeys. [They must not eat outside, without leave of the abbot.]

LIII. Of the Reception of Guests.—All guests are to be received as Christ himself; for He Himself said: ‘I was a stranger and ye took Me in’ [Mt. xxv. 35]. And to all, fitting honour shall be shown; but, most of all, to servants of the faith and to pilgrims. When, therefore, a guest is announced, the prior or the brothers shall run to meet him, with every service of love. And first they shall pray together; and thus they shall be joined together in peace. Which kiss of peace shall not first be offered, unless a prayer have preceded, on account of the wiles of the devil. In the salutation itself, moreover, all humility shall be shown. In the case of all guests arriving or departing: with inclined head, or with prostrating of the whole body upon the ground, Christ, who is also received in them, shall be adored. The guests moreover, having been received, shall be conducted to prayer; and afterwards the prior, or one whom he himself orders, shall sit with them. The law of God shall be read before the guest that he may be edified; and, after this, every kindness shall be shown. A fast may be broken by the prior on account of a guest; unless, perchance, it be a special day of fast which cannot be violated. The brothers, moreover, shall continue their customary fasts. The abbot shall give water into the hands of his guests; and the abbot as well as the whole congregation shall wash the feet of all guests. This being done, they shall say this verse: ‘We have received, O Lord, Thy loving-kindness in the midst of Thy temple’ [Ps. xlvi. 8, Vulgate=xlviii. 9, E.V.]. Chiefly in the reception of the poor and of pilgrims shall care be most anxiously shown: for in them Christ is received the more. For the very fear of the rich exacts honour for them. The kitchen of the abbot and the guests shall be by itself; so that guests coming at uncertain hours, as is always happening in a monastery, may not disturb the brothers. Into the control of this kitchen, two brothers, who can well fulfil that duty, shall enter yearly; and to them, according as they shall need it, help shall be administered; so that they may serve without grumbling. And again, when they are less occupied they shall go out where they are commanded to, and labour. . . .

LIV. Whether a Brother may receive Letters or Gifts. [No; except by leave of the abbot.]

LV. Of Clothing.—Clothing shall be given to the brothers according to the nature of the places where they dwell, or the climate. For in cold regions more is required; but in warm, less. This is a matter for the abbot to decide. We nevertheless consider that for temperate places a cowl and tunic apiece shall suffice—the cowl in winter hairy, in summer fine or worn—and a scapular for work. And for the feet, shoes and stockings. Concerning the colour and size of all of which things the monks shall not talk; but they shall be such as can be found in the province where they are or as can be bought the most cheaply. The abbot, moreover, shall provide, as to the measure, that those vestments be not short for those using them; but of suitable length. And, when new ones are received, they shall always straightforward return the old ones, to be kept in the wardrobe for the benefit of the poor. It is enough, moreover, for a monk to have two tunics and two cowls; a spare one for nights, and to permit them to wash the things themselves. Everything, then, that is over this is superfluous, and ought to be removed. And the shoes, and whatever is old, they shall return when they receive something new. And those who are sent on a journey shall receive cloths for the loins from the wardrobe; which on their return they shall restore, having washed them. And there shall be cowls and tunics somewhat better than those which they have ordinarily: which, when they start on a journey, they shall receive from the wardrobe, and, on returning, shall restore. For bedding, a mattress, a woollen blanket, a woollen under-blanket, and a pillow shall suffice. And these beds are frequently to be searched by the abbot for private property. And, if anything is found belonging to any one which he did not receive from the abbot, he shall be subjected to the most severe discipline. And, in order that this vice of property may be cut off at the roots, all things which are necessary shall be given by the abbot: that is, a cowl, a tunic, shoes, stockings, girdle, a knife, a pen, a needle, a handkerchief, tablets: so that all excuse of necessity shall be removed.

LVIII. Concerning the Manner of receiving Brothers.—When any new comer applies for admission, an easy entrance shall not be granted him: but, as the Apostle says, ‘Try the spirits if they be of God’ [I John iv. 1]. Therefore, if he who comes perseveres in knocking, and is seen after four or five days to endure with patience the insults inflicted upon him, and the difficulty of entrance, and to persist in his demand, entrance shall be allowed him, and he shall remain for a few days in the cell of the guests. After this he shall be in the cell of the novices, where he shall meditate and eat and sleep. And an elder brother shall be appointed for him who shall be capable of saving souls, who shall watch him with the closest scrutiny, and make it his care to see if he reverently seek God, if he be zealous in the service of God, in obedience, in suffering shame. And all the harshness and roughness of the means through which God is approached shall be told him in advance. If he promise perseverance in his steadfastness, after the lapse of two months this Rule shall be read to him in order, and it shall be said to him: ‘Behold the law under which thou dost wish to serve; if thou canst observe it, enter; but if thou canst not, depart freely.’ If he have stood firm thus far, then he shall be taken into the aforesaid cell of the novices; and again he shall be tried with every kind of endurance. And, after the lapse of six months, the Rule shall be read to him; that he may know upon what he is entering. And, if he stand firm thus far, after four months the same Rule shall again be re-read to him. And if, having deliberated with himself, he shall promise to keep everything, and to obey all the commands
that are laid upon him: then he shall be received in the congregation; knowing that it is decreed, by the law of the Rule, that from that day he shall not be allowed to depart from the monastery, nor to free his neck from the yoke of the Rule, which, after such long deliberation, he was at liberty either to refuse or receive. He who is to be received, moreover, shall, in the oratory, in the presence of the whole, make promise concerning his steadfastness and the change in his manner of life and his obedience to God and to His saints; so that if, at any time, he act contrary, he shall know that he shall be condemned by Him whom he mocks. 

LXIV. Of the Appointing of an Abbot.—In appointing an abbot this principle shall always be observed: that such a one shall be put into office as the whole congregation, according to the fear of God, with one heart—or even a part, however small, of the congregation with more prudent counsel—shall have chosen. He who is to be ordained, moreover, shall be elected for merit of life and learnedness in wisdom; even though he be the lowest in rank in the congregation. But even if the whole congregation with one consent shall have elected a person willing to connive at their vices (which God forbid), and those vices shall in any way come clearly to the knowledge of the bishop to whose diocese that place pertains, or to the neighbouring abbots or Christians: the latter shall not allow the consent of the wicked to prevail, but shall set up a worthy steward of the house of God; knowing that they will receive a good reward for this, if they do it in pureness of heart and with zeal for God. Just so they shall know, on the contrary, that they have sinned if they neglect it. The abbot who is ordained, moreover, shall reflect always what a burden he is undertaking, and to whom he is to render account of his stewardship. He shall know that he ought rather to be of help than to command. He ought, therefore, to be learned in the divine law, that he may know how to bring forth both the new and the old; chaste, sober, merciful. He shall always exalt mercy over judgement, that he may obtain the same. He shall hate vice, he shall love the brethren. In his blame itself he shall act prudently and do nothing excessive; lest, while he is too desirous of removing the rust, the vessel be broken. And he shall always suspect his own frailty; and shall remember that bruised reed is not to be crushed. By which we do not say that he shall permit vice to be nourished; but prudently, and with charity, he shall remove it, according as he finds it to be expedient in the case of each one, as we have already said. And he shall strive rather to be loved than feared. He shall not be troubled and anxious; he also shall not be too obstinate; he shall not be jealous and too suspicious; for then he will have no rest. In his commands he shall be prudent, and shall consider whether they be of God or of the world. He shall use discernment and moderation with regard to the labours which he enjoins, thinking of the discretion of holy Jacob who said: ‘if I overdrive my flocks they will die all in one day.’ [Gen. xxxiii. 13]. Accepting therefore this and other testimony of discretion the mother of the virtues, he shall so temper all things that there may be both what the strong desire, and the weak do no shrink from. And, especially, he shall keep the present Rule in all things;...

LXV. Of the Provost.—[Not to consider himself a ‘second abbot.’]

LXVI. Concerning the Doorkeepers of the Monastery.—At the door of the monastery shall be placed a wise old man who shall know how to receive a reply and to return one; whose ripeness of age will not permit him to gossip. The doorkeeper ought to have a cell next to the door; so that those arriving may always find one present from whom they may receive a reply. And straightway, when any one has knocked, or a poor man has called out, he shall answer, ‘Thanks be to God!’ or shall give the blessing; and with all the gentleness of the fear of God he shall quickly give a reply with the fervour of charity. And if this doorkeeper need assistance he may receive a younger brother.

A monastery should, if possible, be so arranged that everything necessary—that is, water, a mill, a garden, a bakery—may be available, and different trades be carried on, within the monastery; so that there shall be no need for the monks to wander about outside. For this is not at all good for their souls. We wish, moreover, that this Rule be read very often in the congregation; lest any of the brothers excuse himself on account of ignorance.

LXVIII. If Impossibilities are enjoined.—If it happen that any overwhelmingly impossible task is set him, a brother should receive the command of one in authority with all meekness and obedience. But if he sees that the weight of the burden is utterly beyond his strength, let him, with patience and at a convenient time, suggest to his Superior what makes it impossible—without presumption or obstinacy or answering back. If, after this suggestion, the command of the superior stand as it was first given, the subordinate shall realize that thus it is expedient for him: and he shall obey, with all charity, and will trust in God’s help.

LXIX. No one shall take it on himself to take another’s part.

LXX. No one shall take it on himself to strike another without orders.

LXXI. Monks shall obey each other.

LXXII. Of the Good Zeal which the Monk, should have.—[A zeal mingled with charity, patience, and tolerance for others.]

LXX. Concerning the Fact that not every Righteous Observance is decreed in this Rule.—We have written out this Rule that we may show those observing it in the monasteries how to have some honesty of character, or the beginning of conversion. But for those who hasten to the perfection of living, there are the teachings of the holy Fathers; the observance of which leads a man to the heights of perfection. For what page, or what discourse, of Divine authority in the Old or the New Testament does not contain a most perfect rule for human life? Or what book of the holy Catholic Fathers does not
tell us with the voice of a trumpet how by the right path we may come to our Creator? And the reading aloud of the Fathers, and their decrees, and their lives; also the Rule of our holy Father Basil—what else are they except instruments of virtue for well-living and obedient monks? We blush with shame for the idle, and the evil-living and the negligent. Thou that hastenest to the heavenly country, perform with Christ’s aid this Rule which is written down as the least of beginnings: and then at length, under God’s protection, thou wilt come to the greater things that we have mentioned; to the heights of learning and virtue.

**Question:**
1. Compare and contrast the role and powers of the Abbot with that of the Pope, as described by Gregory.
7.3 Duke William of Aquitane: *Foundation Charter for the Abbey of Cluny, 909*

The abbey of Cluny was founded in 910 by the monk Berno and Duke William of Aquitane. Cluny became the center of the Cluniac order and, in time, Abbots of Cluny would come to control some 1,000 monastic communities. The wealth and power of Cluny made it a target for twelfth-century advocates of church reform.


It is clear to all men of sane mind that the providence of God so decrees for any rich man that he may be able to deserve everlasting rewards by means of the goods he transitorily possesses, if he uses them well. . . .

And I, William, count [of Auvergne] and duke [of Aquitaine] by the gift of God, carefully pondering this, and desiring to provide for my own salvation while it is permissible for me, have considered it proper, nay, most necessary, that from the goods which have been temporarily conferred upon me, I am to give a small portion for the gain of my soul. . . . And in order to make this deed not a temporary but lasting one, I am to support at my own expense a congregation of monks, trusting and hoping that even though I myself am unable to despise all things, nevertheless, by taking charge of despisers of the world whom I deem to be righteous, “I may receive the reward of the righteous” [Matthew 10, 41].

Therefore. . . . I hand over from my own domains to the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, the following goods legally held by me: the vill of Cluny with the court and demesne manor, and the chapel in honor of Saint Mary, mother of God, and of Saint Peter, prince of the apostles, together with all the goods pertaining to it, namely, the vills, the chapels, the serfs of both sexes, the vines, the fields, the meadows, the waters and their courses, the mills, the entrances and exits, what is cultivated and what is not, all in their entirety. . . . [I give all this] with this understanding, that a regular monastery be constructed in Cluny in honor of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and that there the monks shall congregate and live according to the rule of the blessed Benedict. . . .

And let the monks, as well as all the aforesaid possessions, be under the power and authority of the Abbot Bemon [d. 926], who shall regularly preside over them, as long as he lives, according to his knowledge and ability. But after his death, the same monks are to have power and permission to elect as abbot and rector any one of their order whom they will choose, in keeping with the will of God and the rule promulgated by Saint Benedict, so that they may not be impeded from making a canonical election by our opposition or that of any other power. Every five years, then, the aforesaid monks are to pay ten shillings to the church of the apostles for their lights. . . . We further will that every day they perform works of mercy toward the poor, the needy, the stranger and the pilgrim. . . .

The same monks there congregated are to be subject neither to our sway nor to that of our relatives, nor to the splendor of the royal greatness, nor to that of any earthly power. And I warn and beseech, through God and all His saints, and by the terrible Day of Judgment, that no one of the secular princes, no count whatever, no bishop at all, nor the pontiff of the aforesaid Roman See, is to invade the property of these servants of God, or alienate it, or impair it, or give it as a benefice to any one, or appoint any prelate over them against their will. . . . And I beseech you, Oh Peter and Paul, holy apostles and glorious princes of the earth, and you, Pontiff of the pontiffs of the apostolic see, that. . . you remove from the community of the holy church of God and of life eternal the robbers and invaders and alienators of these goods.

**Question:**

1. What elements of the Rule of St. Benedict are adopted by the Order of the Cluny?
7.4 Behā-ed-Din: Richard I Massacres Prisoners after Taking Acre, 2–20 August 1191

The recapture of Jerusalem by the Muslim leader Saladin in 1187 sparked the Third Crusade. At the key point in the campaign, Richard I of England and King Philip II of France led a successful siege of the city of Acre. As part of the terms of surrender, the Crusaders held 2,700 Muslims as hostages against Saladin’s completion of the remainder of the terms. When Saladin failed to fulfill his part of the bargain, Richard ordered the execution of the hostages. Behā-ed-Din, a member of Saladin’s court, was a witness to the massacre.


The same day Hossām ad-Din Ibn Barīc, an interpreter working with the English, issued from Acre accompanied by two officers of the King of England [Richard I]. He brought news that the King of France had set out for Tyre, and that they had come to talk over the matter of a possible exchange of prisoners and to see the true cross of the Crucifixion if it were still in the Mussulman camp, or to ascertain if it really had been sent to Baghdad. The True Cross was shown to them, and on beholding it they showed the profoundest reverence, throwing themselves on the ground till they were covered with dust, and humbling themselves in token of devotion. These envos told us that the European princes had accepted the Sultan’s [Saladin’s] proposition, viz., to deliver all that was specified in the treaty by three instalments at intervals of a month. The Sultan then sent an envoy to Tyre with rich presents, quantities of perfumes, and fine raiment—all of which were for the King of the French.

In the morning of the tenth day of Ralab, [3 August] Ibn Barīc and his comrades returned to the King of England while the Sultan went off with his bodyguard and his closest friends to the hill that abuts on Shefa’Amr . . . Envos did not cease to pass from one side to the other in the hope of laying the foundation of a firm peace. These negotiations continued till our men had procured the money and the number of prisoners that they were to deliver to the Christians at the end of the first period in accordance with the treaty. The first instalment was to consist of the Holy Cross, 100,000 dinars and 1,600 prisoners. Trustworthy men sent by the Christians to conduct the examination found it all complete saving only the prisoners who had been demanded by name, all of whom had not yet been gathered together. And thus the negotiations continued to drag on till the end of the first term. On this day, the 18th of Rajah [11 August], the enemy sent demanding what was due.

The Sultan replied as follows: ‘Choose one of two things. Either send us back our comrades and receive the payment fixed for this term, in which case we will give hostages to ensure the full execution of all that is left. Or accept what we are going to send you today, and in your turn give us hostages to keep until those of our comrades whom you hold prisoners are restored.’ To this the envos made answer: ‘Not so. Send us what is due for this term and in return we will give our solemn oath that your people shall be restored you.’

This proposition the Sultan rejected, knowing full well that if he were to deliver the money, the Cross, and the prisoners, while our men were still kept captive by the Christians, he would have no security against treachery on the part of the enemy, and this would be a great disaster to Islam.

Then the King of England, seeing all the delays interposed by the Sultan to the execution of the treaty, acted perfidiously as regards his Mussulman prisoners. On their yielding the town of Acre he had engaged to grant them life, adding that if the Sultan carried out the bargain he would give them freedom and suffer them to carry off their children and wives; if the Sultan did not fulfil his engagements they were to be made slaves. Now the King broke his promises to them and made open display of what he had till now kept hidden in his heart, by carrying out what he had intended to do after he had received the money and the Christian prisoners. It is thus that people in his nation ultimately admitted.

In the afternoon of Tuesday, 27 Rajah [20 August], about four o’clock, he came out on horseback with all the Christian army, knights, footmen, Turcopoles [light-armed soldiers of the Order of St John of Jerusalem] and advanced to the pits at the foot of the hill of Al ‘Ayādīyeh, to which place he had already sent on his tents. The Christians, on reaching the middle of the plain that stretches between this hill and that of Keisān, close to which place the Sultan’s advanced guard had drawn back, ordered all the Mussulman prisoners, whose martyrdom God had decreed for this day, to be brought before him. They numbered more than three thousand and were all bound with ropes. The Christians then flung themselves upon them all at once and massacred them with sword and lance in cold blood. Our advanced guard had already told the Sultan of the enemy’s movements and he sent it some reinforcements, but only after the massacre. The Mussulmans, seeing what was being done to the prisoners, rushed against the Christians and in the combat, which lasted till nightfall, several were slain and wounded on either side. On the morrow morning our people gathered at the spot and found the Mussulmans stretched out upon the ground as martyrs for the faith. They even recognized some of the dead, and the sight was a great affliction to them. The enemy had only spared the prisoners of note and such as were strong enough to work.
The motives of this massacre are differently told; according to some, the captives were slain by way of reprisal for the death of those Christians whom the Mussulmans had slain. Others again say that the King of England, on deciding to attempt the conquest of Ascalon, thought it unwise to leave so many prisoners in the town after his departure. God alone knows what the real reason was.

**Question:**
1. What does this account say about the nature of both sides during the Crusades?
7.5 Unam Sanctam: Two Swords

Pope Boniface VIII had tried to limit the fighting within Europe, particularly between the English and the French, by issuing a bull in 1296, that prohibited monarchs from taxing the clergy without papal authorization. King Philip the Fair of France and Edward I of England rejected this bull; they needed those taxes to fund their war efforts. When they retaliated in ways that sharply diminished the papacy's finances, the Pope retreated. After continued dispute, the Pope issued another bull, the Unam Sanctam, excerpted below. Philip responded to this bull by having the Pope captured in order to put him on trial. Instead, he quickly released him, but not before the Pope had suffered both physically and in terms of his pride. When he died a few weeks later, he was replaced by a French pope, Clement V (1305–1314), who soon moved the papacy to Avignon, France.


That there is one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church we are impelled by our faith to believe and to hold—this we do firmly believe and openly confess—and outside of this there is neither salvation or remission of sins, as the bridegroom proclaims in Canticles, “My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother; she is the choice one of her that bare her.” The Church represents one mystic body and of this body Christ is the head; of Christ, indeed. God is the head. In it is one Lord, and one faith, and one baptism. In the time of the flood, there was one ark of Noah, prefiguring the one Church, finished in one cubit, having one Noah as steersman and commander. Outside of this, all things upon the face of the earth were, as we read, destroyed. This Church we venerate and this alone, the Lord saying through his prophets, “Deliver my soul, O God, from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog.” He prays thus for his soul, that is for Himself, as head, and also for the body, which He calls one, namely, the Church on account of the unity of the bridegroom, of the faith, of the sacraments, and of the charity of the Church. It is that seamless coat of the Lord, which was not rent, but fell by lot. Therefore, in this one and only Church, there is one body and one head—not two heads as if it were a monster—namely, Christ and Christ’s Vicar. Peter and Peter’s successor, for the Lord said to Peter himself, “Feed my sheep”: my sheep, he said, using a general term and not designating these or those sheep, so that we must believe that all the sheep were committed to him. If, then, the Greeks or others, shall say that they were not entrusted to Peter and his successors, they must perforce admit that they are not of Christ’s sheep, as the Lord says in John, “there is one fold, and one shepherd.”

In this Church and in its power are two swords, to wit, a spiritual and a temporal, and this we are taught by the words of the Gospel, for when the Apostles said, “Behold, here are two swords” (in the Church, namely, since the Apostles were speaking), the Lord did not reply that it was too many, but enough. And surely he who claims that the temporal sword is not in the power of Peter has but ill understood the word of our Lord when he said, “Put up the sword in its scabbard.” Both, therefore, the spiritual and material swords, are in the power of the Church, the latter indeed to be used for the Church, the former by the Church, the one by the priest, the other by the hand of kings and soldiers, but by the will and sufferance of the priest. It is fitting, moreover, that one sword should be under the other, and the temporal authority subject to the spiritual power. For when the Apostle said “there is no power but of God and the powers that are of God are ordained,” they would not be ordained unless one sword were under the other, and one, as inferior, was brought back by the other to the highest place. Therefore, according to the law of the universe, things are not reduced to order directly, and upon the same footing, but the lowest through the intermediate and the inferior through the superior. It behooves us, therefore, the more freely to confess that the spiritual power excels in dignity and nobility any form whatsoever of earthly power, as spiritual interests exceed the temporal in importance. All this we see fairly from the giving of tithes, from the benediction and sanctification, from the recognition of this power and the control of the same things. For the truth bearing witness, it is for the spiritual power to establish the earthly power and judge it, if it be not good. Thus, in the case of the Church and the power of the Church, the prophecy of Jeremiah is fulfilled: “See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms”—and so forth. Therefore, if the earthly power shall err, it shall be judged by the spiritual power: if the lesser spiritual power err, it shall be judged by the higher. But if the supreme power err, it can be judged by God alone and not by man, the apostles bearing witness saying, the spiritual man judges all things but he himself is judged by no one. Hence this power, although given to man and exercised by man, is not human, but rather divine power, given by the divine lips to Peter, and founded on a rock for Him and his successors in Him whom he confessed, the Lord saying to Peter himself, “Whatsoever thou shalt bind,” etc. Whoever, therefore, shall resist this power, ordained by God, resists
the ordination of God, unless there should be two beginnings, as the Manichaean imagines. But this we judge to be false and heretical, since, by the testimony of Moses, not in the *beginnings*, but in the *beginning*, God created the heaven and the earth. We, moreover, proclaim, declare, and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.

Given at the Lateran the twelfth day before the Kalends of December, in our eighth year, as a perpetual memorial of this matter.

Questions:
1. What are the two swords?
2. What does Boniface claim is the relationship between the two swords? Based on what justification or principles?
7.6 Penitentials

Penitentials were issued to help priests learn and understand their duties as confessors. Confession with penance had been imposed on parishioners at least once a year in the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. The following penitential was issued by Cardinal St. Charles Borromeo (1538–84), who pushed for Church reform and discipline during the Counter-Reformation. The excerpt includes the introduction which outlines the purpose of the penitential and a selection of penances required for various sins listed under each commandment.


Penitential Canons, Knowledge of Which Is Necessary for Parish Priests and Confessors, Set Forth according to the Plan and Order of the Decalog

The fathers taught how very necessary for priests who are engaged in hearing the confessions of penitents is a knowledge of the penitential canons. And indeed if all things that pertain to the method of penance are to be administered not only with prudence and piety but also with justice, assuredly the pattern of this ought to be taken from the penitential canons. For there are, so to speak, two rules by which priests and confessors are so directed as both to discern the gravity of an offense committed and in relation to this to impose a true penance: that they severally accurately investigate both the things that pertain to the greatness of the sin and those that pertain to the status, condition, and age of the penitent and the inmost sorrow of the contrite heart—and then, that they temper the penance with their own justice and prudence. And indeed the method explained by the fathers so disposed these things and everything else that is complicated of this necessary knowledge, that, as was said above in its proper place, the penitential canons set forth according to the plan of the Decalog are held over to the last part of the book, whence some knowledge of them can be drawn by the confessor-priests themselves....

The chief penitential canons collected according to the order of the Decalog from various councils and penitentiary books in the Instruction of St. Charles Borromeo

On the First Commandment of the Decalog

1. He who falls away from the faith shall do penance for ten years.
2. He who observes auguries and divinations and he who makes diabolical incantations, seven years. One who beholds things to come in an astrolabe, two years.
3. If anyone makes knots or enchantments, two years.
4. He who consults magicians, five years.

On the Second Commandment

1. Whoever knowingly commits perjury, shall do penance for forty days on bread and water, and seven succeeding years; and he shall never be without penance. And he shall never be accepted as a witness; and after these things he shall take communion.
2. He who commits perjury in a church, ten years.
3. If anyone publicly blasphemes God or the Blessed Virgin or any saint, he shall stand in the open in front of the doors of the church on seven Sundays, while the solemnities of the masses are performed, and on the last of these days, without robe and shoes, with a cord tied about his neck; and on the seven preceding Fridays he shall fast on bread and water; and he shall then by no means enter the church. Moreover, on each of these seven Sundays he shall feed three or two or one, if he is able. Otherwise he shall do another penance; if he refuses, he shall be forbidden to enter the church; in [case of] his death he shall be denied ecclesiastical burial.
4. He who violates a simple vow shall do penance for three years.
On the Third Commandment

1. He who does any servile work on the Lord’s day or on a feast day shall do penance for seven days on bread and water.
2. If anyone violates fasts set by Holy Church, he shall do penance for forty days on bread and water.
3. He who violates the fast in Lent shall do a seven-day penance for one day.
4. He who without unavoidable necessity eats flesh in Lent shall not take communion at Easter and shall thereafter abstain from flesh.

On the Fourth Commandment

1. He who reviles his parents shall be a penitent for forty days on bread and water.
2. He who does an injury to his parents, three years.
3. He who beats [them], seven years.
4. If anyone rises up against his bishop, his pastor and father, he shall do penance in a monastery all the days of his life.
5. If anyone despises or derides the command of his bishop, or of the bishop’s servants, or of his parish priest, he shall do penance for forty days on bread and water.

On the Fifth Commandment

1. He who kills a presbyter shall do penance for twelve years.
2. If anyone kills his mother, father, or sister, he shall not take the Lord’s body throughout his whole life, except at his departure; he shall abstain from flesh and wine, while he lives; he shall fast on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.
3. If anyone kills a man he shall always be at the door of the church, and at death he shall receive communion.
[Sections 4–10 omitted.]

On the Sixth Commandment

[Sections 1–6 omitted.]

7. If any woman paints herself with ceruse or other pigment in order to please men, she shall do penance for three years.
8. If a priest is intimate with his own spiritual daughter, that is, one whom he has baptized or who has confessed to him, he ought to do penance for twelve years; and if the offense is publicly known, he ought to be deposed and do penance for twelve years on pilgrimage, and thereafter enter a monastery to remain there throughout his life. For adultery penances of seven, and of ten, years, are imposed; for unchaste kissing or embracing a penance of thirty days is commanded.

On the Seventh Commandment

1. If anyone commits a theft of a thing of small value he shall do penance for a year.
2. He who steals anything from the furniture of a church or from the treasury, or ecclesiastical property, or offerings made to the church shall be a penitent for seven years.
3. He who retains to himself his tithe or neglects to pay it, shall restore fourfold and do penance for twenty days on bread and water.
4. He who takes usury commits robbery; he shall do penance for three years on bread and water.

On the Eighth Commandment

1. He who conspires in falsification of evidence shall be a penitent for five years.
2. A forger shall do penance on bread and water as long as he lives.
3. If anyone slanders his neighbor, he shall be a penitent for seven days on bread and water.
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On the Ninth and Tenth Commandments

1. He who basely covets another’s goods and is avaricious shall be a penitent for three years.
2. If anyone desires to commit fornication, if a bishop, he shall be a penitent for seven years; if a presbyter, five; if a deacon or monk three; if a cleric or layman, two years.

Questions:
1. What role did the priest have in applying the penitentials?
2. With what kind of sins were the penitentials concerned, and which were considered the worst?
7.7 The Siege of Lisbon

On the way to join the Second Crusade in 1147, Crusading knights from England, Germany, Flanders, and Normandy interrupted their voyage to assist King Alfonso of Castile besiege Lisbon, held by Muslim rulers since the eighth century. In return for their help, the king promised that they could plunder and pillage the city when it fell.


Then our men, attending more strictly to the siege, began to dig a subterranean mine between the tower and the Porta do Ferro in order that they might bring down the wall. When this had been discovered, for it was quite accessible to the enemy, it proved greatly to our detriment after the investment of the city, for many days were consumed in its vain defense. Besides, two Balearic mangonels were set up by our forces—one on the river bank which was operated by seamen, the other in front of the Porta do Ferro, which was operated by the knights and their table companions. All these men having been divided into groups of one hundred, on a given signal the first hundred retired and another took their places, so that within the space of ten hours five thousand stones were hurled. And the enemy were greatly harassed by this action. Again the Normans and the English and those who were with them began the erection of a movable tower eighty-three feet in height. Once more, with a view to bringing down the wall, the men of Cologne and the Flemings began to dig a mine beneath the wall of the stronghold higher up—a mine which, marvelous to relate, had five entrances and extended inside to a depth of forty cubits from the front; and they completed it within a month.

Meanwhile, hunger and the stench of corpses greatly tormented the enemy, for there was no burial space within the city. And for food they collected the refuse which was thrown out from our ships and borne up by the waves beneath their walls. A ridiculous incident occurred as a result of their hunger when some of the Flemings, while keeping guard among the ruins of houses, were eating figs and, having had enough, left some lying about unconsumed. When this was discovered by four of the Moors, they came up stealthily and cautiously like birds approaching food. And when the Flemings observed this, they frequently scattered refuse of this sort about in order that they might lure them on with bait. And, finally, having set snares in the accustomed places, they caught three of the Moors in them and thereby caused enormous merriment among us.

When the wall had been undermined and inflammable material had been placed within the mine and lighted, the same night at cockcrow about thirty cubits of the wall crumbled to the ground. Then the Moors who were guarding the wall were heard to cry out in their anguish that they might now make an end of their long labors and that this very day would be their last and that it would have to be divided with death, and that this would be their greatest consolation for death, if, without fearing it, they might exchange their lives for ours. For it was necessary to go yonder whence there was no need of returning; and, if a life were well ended, it would nowhere be said to have been cut short. For what mattered was not how long but how well a life had been lived; and a life would have lasted as long as it should, even though not as long as it naturally could, provided it closed in a fitting end. And so the Moors gathered from all sides for the defense of the breach in the wall, placing against it a barrier of beams. Accordingly, when the men of Cologne and the Flemings went out to attempt an entrance, they were repulsed. For, although the wall had collapsed, the nature of the situation [on the steep hillside] prevented an entry merely by the heap [of ruins]. But when they failed to overcome the defenders in a hand-to-hand encounter, they attacked them furiously from a distance with arrows, so that they looked like hedgehogs as, bristling with bolts, they stood immovably at the defense and endured as if unharmed. Thus the defense was maintained against the onslaught of the attackers until the first hour of the day, when the latter retired to camp. The Normans and the English came under arms to take up the struggle in place of their associates, supposing that an entrance would be easy now that the enemy were wounded and exhausted. But they were prevented by the leaders of the Flemings and the men of Cologne, who assailed them with insults and demanded that we attempt an entrance in any way it might be accomplished with our own engines; for they said that they had prepared the breach which now stood open for themselves, not for us. And so for several days they were altogether repulsed from the breach.

Questions:
1. How did the Crusaders prepare before battle?
2. What machines and techniques did they use in besieging and taking the cities?
3. How were the city’s inhabitants and defenders treated by the Christian knights?
4. What sort of cooperation was there between different nationalities of Crusaders?
8.1 Manorial Court Records

The lord of the manor held a court for his tenants, both free and unfree, regulating rights in land and settling disputes according to local custom. For the unfree serfs, this was their only court for legal redress. In England, the manorial courts sometimes absorbed the local “hundred courts” over which the county sheriff theoretically ought to have presided. As a result, the jurisdiction of the manorial court was quite varied. Below are some thirteenth-century records of manorial courts held by the Abbey of Bec in England.


**PLEAS OF THE MANORS IN ENGLAND OF THE ABBEY OF BEC FOR THE HOKEDAY TERM, 1246**

**Bledlow [Buckinghamshire]. Saturday before Ascension Day.**

1 The court has presented that Simon Combe has set up a fence on the lord’s land. Therefore let it be abated.1
2 Simone Combe gives 18 d.2 for leave to compromise with Simon Besmere. Pledges, John Sperling and John Harding.
3 A day is given to Alice of Standen at the next court to produce her charter and her heir.
4 John Sperling complains that Richard of Newmere on the Sunday next before S. Bartholomew’s day last past with his cattle, horses and pigs wrongfully destroyed the corn on his [John’s] land to his damage to the extent of one thrave of wheat, and to his dishonour to the extent of two shillings; and of this he produces suit. And Richard comes and defends all of it. Therefore let him go to the law six-handed.3 His pledges, Simon Combe and Hugh Frith.

**Swincombe [Oxfordshire]. Sunday before Ascension Day.**

5 Richard Rastold [essoins himself]4 of the general summons by William Henry’s son.
6 Hugh Pike and Robert his son are in mercy for wood of the lord thievishly carried away. The fine for each, 6 s. 8 d. Pledges, Richard Mile and William Shepherd.
7 Peter Alexander’s son in mercy for the same. Fine, 2 s. Pledge, Alexander his father.
9 John Smith in mercy for not producing what he was pledge to produce. Pledges, Richard Etys and Hugh Wood. Fine, 12 d.
10 Roger Abovewood and William Shepherd in mercy for not producing what they were pledges to produce.... Fine, half a sextary of wine.

**Tooting [Surrey]. Sunday after Ascension Day.**

11 The court presented that the following had encroached on the lord’s land, to wit,5 William Cobbler, Maud Robin’s widow (fined 12 d.), John Shepherd (fined 12 d.), Walter Reeve (fined 2 s.), William of Moreville (fined 12 d.), Hamo of Hageldon (fined 12 d.), Mabel Spendlove’s widow (fined 6 d.). Therefore they are in mercy.
12 ... Roger Rede in mercy for detention of rent. Pledge, John of Stratham. Fine, 6 d.
13 William of Streatham is in mercy for not producing what he was pledge to produce. Fine, 12d.

---

1 Removed.
2 The abbreviations for coins were: d. = pence, s. = shilling, and l = pound. Twelve pence = 1 shilling and 20 shillings = 1 pound. The amount 6s.8d. was equal to 1 mark which was not a coin, but an amount of money. (For example: The old expression “2 bits” equals a quarter coin, but there was never coin minted that equaled one “bit.”) Three marks = 1 pound.
3 To “make his law” or “go to the law six-handed” means that he must bring five men of lawful reputation to swear with him that they believe he is a man who is telling the truth.
4 Presents a legal excuse for himself for not appearing in court when summoned to do so.
5 Namely.
6 All adult free males in England became a member of a “tithing” about the age 14. A tithing was a group of about ten men who were legally responsible for one another’s actions. At the “Hundred” court, the local court like a township court, the sheriff would question the members of a tithing to report crimes and problems as well as locate people when they were needed in court.
Ruislip [Middlesex]. Tuesday after Ascension Day.

14 The court presents that Nicholas Brakespeare is not in a tithing and holds land. Therefore let him be distrained.7

15 Breakers of the assize: Alice Salvage’s widow (fined 12 d.), Agnotta the Shepherd’s mistress, Roger Canon (fined 6 d.), the wife of Richard Chayham, the widow of Peter Beyngdgrove, the wife of Ralph Coke (fined 6 d.), Ailwin (fined 6 d.), John Shepherd (fined 6 d.), Geoffrey Carpenter, Roise the Miller’s wife (fined 6 d.), William White, John Carpenter, John Bradif.

16 Roger Hamo’s son gives 20 s. to have seisin of the land which was his father’s and to have an inquest of twelve as to a certain croft which Gilbert Bisuthe holds. Pledges, Gilbert Lamb, William John’s son and Robert King.

17 Isabella Peter’s widow is in mercy for a trespass which her son John had committed in the lord’s wood. Fine, 18 d. Pledges, Gilbert Bisuthe and Richard Robin.

18 Richard Maleville is at his law against the lord [to prove] that he did not take from the lord’s servants goods taken in distress to the damage and dishonour of his lord [to the extent of] 20 s. Pledges, Gilbert Bisuthe and Richard Hubert.

19 Hugh Tree in mercy for his beasts caught in the lord’s garden. Pledges, Walter Hill and William Slipper. Fine, 6 d.

20 [The] twelve jurors say that Hugh Cross has right in the bank and hedge about which there was a dispute between him and William White. Therefore let him hold in peace and let William be distrained for his many trespasses. (Afterwards he made fine10 for 12 s.) They say also that the hedge which is between the Widow Druet and William Slipper so far as the bank extends should be divided along the middle of the bank, so that the crest of the bank should be the boundary between them, for the crest was thrown up along the ancient boundary.

21 [The roll is torn in places for the next two entries]... son of Roger Clerk gives 20 s. to have seisin of the land which was his father’s. Pledges, Gilbert...and Hugh Cross.

22 [Name missing] gives 13 s. 4d. to have seisin of the land which was his mother’s beyond the wood. Pledges, William... and Robert Mareleward.


23 Richard le Boys of Aldeston has sworn fealty for the land which was his father’s and has found pledges for 4 s. as his relief, to wit, William Clerk of the same place, Godfrey Elder and Roger Smith.

24 Elias Deyte in full court resigned his land and William Deyte his son was put in seisin of it and swore fealty and found the same pledges for 5 s. as his relief. Afterwards he paid.

25 The township presents that they suspect Robert Dochy and William Tale because they made fine with the knights, [who formed the jury] before the justices [in eyre]11 when they were accused of larceny.


27 William Green and Guy Lawman have gallons which are too small.

28 John Mercer will give three chickens yearly at Martinmas for having the lord’s patronage and he is received into a tithing.

Wreatham [Norfolk]. Friday after the feast of S. Michael.

30 Gilbert Richard’s son gives 5 s. for license to marry a wife. Pledge, Seaman. Term [for payment.] the Purification.

Tooting [Surrey]. Tuesday after the feast of S. Denis.


32 John Shepherd in mercy for encroaching beyond the boundary of his land. Pledge, Walter Reeve. Fine, 6 d.

33 ... Elias of Streatham in mercy for default of service in the autumn. Fine, 6 d.

7 “Distrained” means that some part of Nicholas’ property will be taken into the custody of the court to motivate him to join a tithing like any law abiding landholder ought to.

8 “Breakers of the assize” sold ale or bread that did not meet the established standards of quality and price.

9 Lawful possession.

10 Made Payment.

11 The Justices in eyre were the king’s justices that went from county to county in England on a regular circuit.
34 Bartholomew Chaloner who was at his law against Reginald Swain’s son has made default in his law. Therefore he is in mercy and let him make satisfaction to Reginald for his damage and dishonour with 6 s. Pledges, William Cobbler and William Spendlove. Fine, 6 gallons.

35 Ralph of Morville gives a half-mark on the security of Jordan of Streatham and William Spendlove to have a jury to inquire whether he be the next heir to the land which William of Morville holds. And [the] twelve jurors come and say that he has no right in the said land but that William Scot has greater right in the said land than any one else. And the said William [Scot] gives 1 mark on the security of Hamo of Hageldon, William of Morville, Reginald Swain and Richard Leaware that he may have seisin of the said land after the death of William of Morville in case he [William Scot] shall survive him [William of Morville].

36 Afterwards came the said William Scot and by the lord’s leave quit-claimed all the right that he had in the said land with its appurtenances to a certain William son of William of Morville, who gives 20 s. to have seisin of the said land and is put in seisin of it and has sworn fealty. Walter the serjeant is to receive the pledges.

Deverill [Wiltshire]. Saturday after the feast of S. Leonard.

37 ... Arnold Smith is in mercy for not producing the said William Scut whose pledge he was.

38 The parson of the church is in mercy for his cow caught in the lord’s meadow. Pledges, Thomas Guner and William Coke.

39 From William Cobbe, William Coke and Walter Dogskin 2 s. for the ward of seven pigs belonging to Robert Gentil and for the damage that they did in the lord’s corn. [Maitland believes that they were amerced for not guarding the lord’s crops]

40 From Martin Shepherd 6 d. for the wound that he gave Pekin.

Questions:
1. What range of cases and business was heard at these manorial courts?
2. What do you think a “pledge” did? What does “in mercy” mean?
3. How did the court determine the facts in disputes?
4. What sort of penalties did the court lay on the guilty?
5. What happened when a juvenile did something wrong?
8.2 “The Sports of the City”

In the late twelfth century traveler William FitzStephen writes in his description of London, “Furthermore let us consider also the sports of the City, since it is not meet that a city should only be useful and sober, unless it also be pleasant and merry.”


London in place of shows in the theatre and stage-plays has holier plays, wherein are shown forth the miracles wrought by Holy Confessors or the sufferings which glorified the constancy of Martyrs.

Moreover, each year upon the day called Carnival—to begin with the sports of boys (for we were all boys once)—boys from the schools bring fighting-cocks to their master, and the whole forenoon is given up to boyish sport; for they have a holiday in the schools that they may watch their cocks do battle. After dinner all the youth of the City goes out into the fields in a much-frequented game of ball. The scholars of each school have their own ball, and almost all the workers of each trade have theirs also in their hands. Elder men and fathers and rich citizens come on horseback to watch the contests of their juniors and after their fashion are young again with the young; and it seems that the motion of their natural heat is kindled by the contemplation of such violent motion and by their partaking in the joys of untrammelled youth.

Every Sunday in Lent after dinner a ‘fresh swarm of young gentles’ goes forth on war-horses, ‘steeds skilled in the contest, of which each is ‘apt and schooled to wheel in circles round’. From the gates burst forth in throngs the lay sons of citizens, armed with lance and shield, the younger with shafts forked at the end, but with steel point removed. ‘They wake war’s semblance’ and in mimic contest exercise their skill at arms. Many courtiers come too, when the King is in residence; and from the households of Earls and Barons come young men not yet invested with the belt of knighthood, that they may there contend together. Each one of them is on fire with hope of victory. The fierce horses neigh, ‘their limbs tremble; they champ the bit; impatient of delay they cannot stand still’. When at length ‘the hoof of trampling steeds careers along’, the youthful riders divide their hosts; some pursue those that fly before, and cannot overtake them; others unhorse their comrades and speed by.

At the feast of Easter they make sport with naval tourneys, as it were. For a shield being strongly bound to a stout pole in mid-stream, a small vessel, swiftly driven on by many an oar and by the river’s flow, carries a youth standing at the prow, who is to strike the shield with his lance. If he break the lance by striking the shield and keep his feet unshaken, he has achieved his purpose and fulfilled his desire. If, however, he strike it strongly without splintering his lance, he is thrown into the rushing river, and the boat of its own speed passes him by. But there are on each side of the shield two vessels moored, and in them are many youths to snatch up the striker who has been sucked down by the stream, as soon as he emerges into sight or ‘once more bubbles on the topmost wave’. On the bridge and the galleries above the river are spectators of the sport ‘ready to laugh their fill’.

On feast-days throughout the summer the youths exercise themselves in leaping, archery and wrestling, putting the stone, and throwing the thonged javelin beyond a mark, and fighting with sword and buckler. ‘Cytherea leads the dance of maidens and the earth is smitten with free foot at moonrise.’

In winter on almost every feast-day before dinner either foaming boars and hogs, armed with ‘tusks lightning-swift’, themselves soon to be bacon, fight for their lives, or fat bulls with butting horns, or huge bears, do combat to the death against hounds let loose upon them.
When the great marsh that washes the northern walls of the City is frozen, dense throngs of youths go forth to disport themselves upon the ice. Some gathering speed by a run, glide sidelong, with feet set well apart, over a vast space of ice. Others make themselves seats of ice like millstones and are dragged along by a number who run before them holding hands. Sometimes they slip owing to the greatness of their speed and fall, every one of them, upon their faces. Others there are, more skilled to sport upon the ice, who fit to their feet the shin-bones of beasts, lashing them beneath their ankles, and with ironshod poles in their hands they strike ever and anon against the ice and are borne along swift as a bird in flight or a bolt shot from a mangonel. But sometimes two by agreement run one against the other from a great distance and, raising their poles, strike one another. One or both fall, not without bodily hurt, since on falling they are borne a long way in opposite directions.

Many of the citizens delight in taking their sport with birds of the air, merlins and falcons and the like, and with dogs that wage warfare in the woods. The citizens have the special privilege of hunting in Middlesex, Hertfordshire and all Chiltern, and in Kent as far as the river Cray.

Questions:
1. What kind of sports were popular in London?
2. Who is missing from this description of public play in London? Why?
8.3 College Life: Between Students and Their Fathers

European universities first emerged in the middle ages and western universities today are descended from them. The administrative structure, system of degrees, and even the robes worn at graduation are vestiges of the twelfth century. The following selections reveal the personal and social aspect of college life.


FATHERS TO SONS

I

I have recently discovered that you live dissolutely and slothfully, preferring license to restraint and play to work and strumming a guitar while the others are at their studies, whence it happens that you have read but one volume of law while your more industrious companions have read several. Wherefore I have decided to exhort you herewith to repent utterly of your dissolute and careless ways, that you may no longer be called a waster and your shame may be turned to good repute.

II

I have learned—not from your master, although he ought not to hide such things from me, but from a certain trustworthy source—that you do not study in your room or act in the schools as a good student should, but play and wander about, disobedient to your master and indulging in sport and in certain other dishonorable practices which I do not now care to explain by letter.

SONS TO FATHERS

I

“Well-beloved father, I have not a penny, nor can I get any save through you, for all things at the University are so dear: nor can I study in my Code or my Digest, for they are all tattered. Moreover, I owe ten crowns in dues to the Provost, and can find no man to lend them to me; I send you word of greetings and of money.

The Student hath need of many things if he will profit here; his father and his kin must needs supply him freely, that he be not compelled to pawn his books, but have ready money in his purse, with gowns and furs and decent clothing, or he will be damned for a beggar; wherefore, that men may not take me for a beast, I send you word of greetings and of money.

Wines are dear, and hostels, and other good things; I owe in every street, and am hard bested to free myself from such snares. Dear father, design to help me! I fear to be excommunicated; already have I been cited, and there is not even a dry bone in my larder. If I find not the money before this feast of Easter, the church door will be shut in my face: wherefore grant my supplication, for I send you word of greetings and of money.

L’Envoy

Well-beloved father, to ease my debts contracted at the tavern, at the baker’s, with the doctor and the bedells [a minor college official], and to pay my subscriptions to the laundress and the barber, I send you word of greetings and of money.”
Sing unto the Lord a new song, praise him with stringed instruments and organs, rejoice upon the high-sounding cymbals, for your son has held a glorious disputation, which was attended by a great number of teachers and scholars. He answered all questions without a mistake, and no one could get the better of him or prevail against his arguments. Moreover he celebrated a famous banquet, at which both rich and poor were honoured as never before, and he has duly begun to give lectures which are already so popular that others’ classrooms are deserted and his own are filled.

Questions:
1. How do the relationships between these fathers and sons resemble those of the present day?
2. From these letters, can you discern any major differences between college life today and 500 years ago?
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8.4 St. Thomas Aquinas: *The Summa against the Gentiles (Summa Contra Gentiles, 1259–1264)*

St. Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) was perhaps the most important medieval theologian. As a leading proponent of scholasticism, he was deeply interested in the problem of reconciling Christian theology and classical philosophy. In the excerpt from his *Summa Contra Gentiles* included here, Aquinas defined the relationship between truths known by reason and truths known by faith.


**BOOK 1**

**CHAPTER 3**

The Two Ways of Knowing the Truth about God.

There are two ways of knowing what we hold to be true about God. There are some truths about God that exceed the capacity of human reason—for example the fact that God is three and one. There are also some truths that natural reason can attain, such as that God exists, that he is one, and other truths of this kind. These are truths about God that have been conclusively proved by philosophers making use of their natural reason.

It is evident that there are some things to be known about God that completely exceed the capacity of human reason. Since all the knowledge that a person has about a thing is based on his understanding of its substance (according to the Philosopher [Aristotle] the basis for any argument is “what a thing is”), the way the substance of a thing is understood must determine what is known about it. Thus if the human intellect comprehends the substance of, say, a stone or a triangle, no intelligible aspect of that thing is beyond the capacity of the human reason. However this is not the case for us with God. The human intellect can not achieve the understanding of God’s substance by means of its natural capacity because in this life all knowledge that is in our intellects originates in the senses. Hence things that are not perceived by the senses cannot be grasped by the human intellect except in so far as knowledge of them is gathered from the senses. But the objects of the senses cannot lead the human intellect to the point that in them it can see the divine substance as it is, for they are effects that are not equal in power to their cause. However our intellect is led from the objects of the senses to the knowledge of the existence of God—as well as to other attributes of the First Principle. Therefore there are some things that can be known about God that are available to human reason, but there are others that totally exceed its power.

**Chapter 4**

Truths about God that are Known by Reason are also Properly Made Available to Man by Faith.

If it were left solely to reason to seek the truth about God, few men would possess a knowledge of God. There are three reasons why most men are prevented from carrying out the diligent inquiry that leads to the discovery of truth. Some are prevented from doing so because of their physical disinclination—as a result of which many men by nature are not disposed to learning. And so however earnest they are, they cannot attain the highest level of human knowledge which consists in knowing God. Others are prevented from doing so by the pressures of family life. Some men must devote themselves to managing temporal affairs and thus are not able to spend time in leisurely contemplative inquiry, so as to reach the highest point of human inquiry—the knowledge of God. Laziness prevents others. To know what reason can investigate concerning God requires that one already have a knowledge of many things, since almost all of philosophy is directed towards the knowledge of God. This is why we learn metaphysics, which is concerned with the divine, last among the subjects in the field of philosophy. The study of truth requires a considerable effort—which is why few are willing to undertake it out of love of knowledge—despite the fact that God has implanted a natural appetite for such knowledge in the minds of men.

---

1 Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, II, 3. For medieval philosophy, *substantia* is the underlying reality that distinguishes a thing from others and gives it independent existence.

2 First Principle—God as the Foundation of all creation. For Aquinas’s argument that reason can lead us to the knowledge of the existence of God, see *Summa Theologiae*, I, qu. 2, a. 3. (p. 30).
CHAPTER 7

Truths Based on Reason Are Not Contrary to the Truth of the Christian Faith.

Although the truth of the Christian faith exceeds the capacity of human reason, truths that reason is fitted by nature to know cannot be contrary to the truth of faith. The things that reason is fitted by nature to know are clearly most true, and it would be impossible to think of them as false. It is also wrong to think that something that is held by faith could be false since it is clearly confirmed by God. Since we know by definition that what is false is contrary to the truth, it is impossible for the principles that reason knows by nature to be contrary to the truth of faith.

We conclude therefore that any arguments made against the doctrines of faith are incorrectly derived from the self-evident first principles of nature. Such conclusions do not have the force of proofs, but are either doubtful opinions or sophistries, and so it is possible to answer them.

CHAPTER 8

The Relationship between the Human Reason and the Primary Truth of Faith.

There is a further point to be considered. The objects of the senses on which human reason bases its knowledge retain some traces of likeness to God, since they exist and are good. This resemblance is inadequate because it is completely insufficient to manifest the substance of God. Effects possess a resemblance to causes in their own particular way because everything that acts does so in ways like itself, but effects do not always exhibit a perfect likeness to their cause. Now human reason is related to the knowledge of the truth of faith—which can only be known fully by those who see the divine substance—in such a way that reason can attain likenesses of it that are true but not sufficient to comprehend the truth conclusively or as known in itself. Yet it is useful for the human mind to exercise its powers of reasoning, however weak, in this way provided that there is no presumption that it can comprehend or demonstrate [the substance of the divine]. For it is most pleasing to be able to see some aspect of the loftiest things, however weak and inadequate our consideration of them may be.

Question:
1. What truths about God are reserved to faith? What can reason tell us about God?

3 Nature, for Aquinas, is purposive and man’s intellect is directed by nature to the knowledge of truth.
8.5 Guilds: Regulating the Craft

Tradesmen, craftsmen, and merchants organized themselves into guilds, associations that maintained a monopoly, guaranteed quality, and regulated prices and standards of production. The following articles regulated the Spurriers (1345) in London and illustrate the guild principle as it applied to the industrial trade of making spurs.


ARTICLES OF THE LONDON SPURRIERS, 1347

Be it remembered, that on Tuesday, the morrow of St. Peter’s Chains [1 August], in the 19th year of the reign of King Edward the Third etc., the Articles underwritten were read before John Hamond, Mayor, Roger de Depham, Recorder, and the other Aldermen; and seeing that the same were deemed befitting, they were accepted and enrolled, in these words:

“In the first place,—that no one of the trade of Spurriers shall work longer than from the beginning of the day until curfew rung out at the Church of St. Sepulchre, without Neugate; by reason that no man can work so neatly by night as by day.

And many persons of the said trade, who compass how to practise deception in their work, desire to work by night rather than by day: and then they introduce false iron, and iron that has been cracked, for tin, and also, they put gilt on false copper, and cracked.

And further, many of the said trade are wandering about all day, without working at all at their trade; and then, when they have become drunk and frantic, they take to their work, to the annoyance of the sick and of all their neighbourhood, as well as by reason of the broils that arise between them and the strange folks who are dwelling among them.

And then they blow up their fires so vigorously, that their forges begin all at once to blaze; to the great peril of themselves and of all the neighbourhood around. And then too, all the neighbours are much in dread of the sparks, which so vigorously issue forth in all directions from the mouths of the chimneys in their forges.

By reason whereof, it seems unto them that working by night [should be put an end to] in order such false work and such perils to avoid; and therefore, the Mayor and Aldermen do will, by assent of the good folks of the said trade, and for the common profit, that from henceforth such time for working, and such false work made in the trade, shall be forbidden.

And if any person shall be found in the said trade to do to the contrary hereof, let him be amerced1, the first time in 40 d [pence], one half thereof to go to the use of the Chamber of the Guildhall of London, and the other half to the use of the said trade; the second time, in half a mark, and the third time, in 10 s [shillings], to the use of the same Chamber and trade; and the fourth time, let him forswear the trade for ever.

“Also,—that no one of the said trade shall hang his spurs out on Sunday, or on other days that are Double Feasts; but only a sign indicating his business: and such spurs as they shall so sell, they are to show and sell within their shops, without exposing them without, or opening the doors or windows of their shops, on the pain aforesaid.

“Also,—that no one of the said trade shall keep a house or shop to carry on his business, unless he is free of the City;2 and that no one shall cause to be sold, or exposed for sale, any manner of old spurs for new ones; or shall garnish them, or change them for new ones.

“Also,—that no one of the said trade shall take an apprentice for a less term than seven years; and such apprentice shall be enrolled, according to the usages of the said city.

“Also,—that if any one of the said trade, who is not a freeman, shall take an apprentice for a term of years, he shall be amerced, as aforesaid.

“Also,—that no one of the said trade shall receive the apprentice, serving-man, or journeyman, of another in the same trade, during the term agreed upon between his master and him; on the pain aforesaid.
“Also,—that no alien of another country, or foreigner of this country, shall follow or use the said trade, unless he is enfranchised before the Mayor, Aldermen, and Chamberlain; and that, by witness and surety of the good folks of the said trade, who will undertake for him as to his loyalty and his good behaviour.

“Also,—that no one of the said trade shall work on Saturdays, after None has been rung out in the City; and not from that hour until the Monday morning following.”

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 8.5 and 8.6.
1. In what ways did their articles guarantee a monopoly to guild members? How did the guilds maintain quality and prevent fraud?
2. Who was eligible for membership in the guilds?
3. With what other activities besides regulation of their trade did the guilds concern themselves?
4. How did rivalry between guilds express itself in Florence?
8.6 “For the Honor of the Guild,” Social Responsibility

These documents each pertain to one of the various guilds in Florence. The first are the articles regulating the wine merchants; the second is a petition from the silk guild to the government of Florence; and the last is a decree passed by the Lana (Wool) guild. Each of these three sources reveals another dimension of the guilds that extended beyond simple regulation of their trade.


The Corporation of Wine Merchants

[Chapter 18] It is also decreed and ordained that the consuls [of the guild] are required, by their oath, to force all of the winesellers... who sell at retail in the city and contado of Florence to swear allegiance to this guild and for this guild. And for this purpose they must make a monthly search through the city and the suburbs of Florence, and if they find anyone who is not matriculated in the guild, they must require him to swear allegiance.... And whoever, as has been said, is engaged in this trade, even though he is not... matriculated in the guild... is considered to be a member of the guild.... And each newly matriculated wineseller... must pay... 5 lire to the guild treasurer... as his matriculation fee.... If, however, he is a father or son of a guild member, then he is not required to pay anything.

[Chapter 20] The consuls, treasurer, and notary of the guild are required to assemble together wherever they wish... to render justice to whoever demands it of the men of this guild, against any and all those... who sell wine at retail... in the city, contado, and district of Florence.

[Chapter 21] It is decreed and ordained that each wine-seller shall come to the assembly of the guild as often as he is summoned by the consuls.... The consuls are required to levy a fine of 10 soldi... against whoever violates this [rule], and the same penalty is to be incurred by anyone who fails to respond to the consuls’ order to come to the guild’s offering in a church.... And if necessity requires that the members of the guild assemble under their banner to stand guard, or to go on a march, by day or night, in the city and contado of Florence or elsewhere, every member of the guild is required to appear in person, with or without arms as ordered, with their standard-bearer and under their banner, or pay a fine of 10 lire.

[Chapter 35] For the honor of the guild and of the members of the guild, it is decreed and ordained that whenever any member of the guild dies, all guild members in the city and suburbs who are summoned by the messenger of the guild... are required to go to the service for the dead man, and to stay there until he is buried.... And the consuls are required to send the guild messenger, requesting and inviting the members of the guild to participate in the obsequies for the dead.

A CHARITABLE ENTERPRISE, 1421

... This petition is presented with all due reverence to you, lord priors, on behalf of your devoted sons of the guild of Por Santa Maria [the silk guild] and the merchants and guildsmen of that association. It is well known to all of the people of Florence that this guild has sought, through pious acts, to conserve... and also to promote your republic and this guild. It has begun to construct a most beautiful edifice in the city of Florence and in the parish of S. Michele Visdomini, next to the piazza called the “Frati de’ Servi.” [This building is] a hospital called S.Maria degli Innocenti, in which shall be received those who, against natural law, have been deserted by their fathers or their mothers, that is, infants, who in the vernacular are called gittatelli [literally, castaways; foundlings]. Without the help and favor of your benign lordships, it will not be possible to transform this laudable objective into reality nor after it has been achieved, to preserve and conserve it.

And since [we] realized that your lordships and all of the people are, in the highest degree, committed to works of charity, [we have] decided to have recourse to your clemency, and to request, most devotedly, all of the things which are described below. So on behalf of the above-mentioned guild, you are humbly petitioned... to enact a law that this guild of
Por Santa Maria and its members and guildsmen—as founders, originators, and principals of this hospital—are understood in perpetuity to be... the sole patrons, defenders, protectors, and supporters of this hospital as representatives of, and in the name of, the popolo and Commune of Florence.

Item, the consuls of the guild... have authority to choose supervisors and governors of the hospital and of the children and servants.

**GUILD RIVALRY, 1425**

The above-mentioned consuls, assembled together in the palace of the [Lana]1 guild in sufficient numbers and in the accustomed manner for the exercise of their office... have diligently considered the law approved by the captains of the society of the blessed Virgin Mary of Orsanmichele. This law decreed, in effect, that for the ornamentation of that oratory, each of the twenty-one guilds of the city of Florence... in a place assigned to each of them by the captains of the society, should construct... a tabernacle, properly and carefully decorated, for the honor of the city and the beautification of the oratory. The consuls have considered that all of the guilds have finished their tabernacles, and that those constructed by the Calimala and Cambio guilds, and by other guilds, surpass in beauty and ornamentation that of the Lana guild. So it may truly be said that this does not redound to the honor of the Lana guild, particularly when one considers the magnificence of that guild which has always sought to be the master and the superior of the other guilds.

For the splendor and honor of the guild, the lord consuls desire to provide a remedy for this.... They decree that through the month of August, the existing lord consuls and their successors in office, by authority of the present provision, are to construct, fabricate, and remake a tabernacle and a statue of the blessed Stephen, protomartyr, protector and defender of the renowned Lana guild, in his honor and in reverence to God. They are to do this by whatever ways and means they choose, which will most honorably contribute to the splendor of the guild, so that this tabernacle will exceed, or at least equal, in beauty and decoration the more beautiful ones. In the construction of this tabernacle and statue, the lord consuls may spend... up to 1,000 florins. And during this time, the lord consuls may commission that statue and tabernacle to the person or persons, and for that price or prices, and with whatever agreement and time or times which seem to them to be most useful for the guild.

**Questions:**

The following questions pertain to documents 8.5 and 8.6.

1. In what ways did their articles guarantee a monopoly to guild members? How did the guilds maintain quality and prevent fraud?
2. Who was eligible for membership in the guilds?
3. With what other activities besides regulation of their trade did the guilds concern themselves?
4. How did rivalry between guilds express itself in Florence?
8.7 The Ideal Wife of a Merchant

Alberti, a Florentine Renaissance humanist, presents a picture of the ideal wife as described by a fictional, rich old Florentine merchant.


After my wife had been settled in my house a few days, and after her first pangs of longing for her mother and family had begun to fade, I took her by the hand and showed her around the whole house. I explained that the loft was the place for grain and that the stores of wine and wood were kept in the cellar. I showed her where things needed for the table were kept, and so on, through the whole house. At the end there were no household goods of which my wife had not learned both the place and the purpose. Then we returned to my room, and, having locked the door, I showed her my treasures, silver, tapestry, garments, jewels, and where each thing had its place....

Only my books and records and those of my ancestors did I determine to keep well sealed.... These my wife not only could not read, she could not even lay hands on them. I kept my records at all times... locked up and arranged in order in my study, almost like sacred and religious objects. I never gave my wife permission to enter that place, with me or alone. I also ordered her, if she ever came across any writing of mine, to give it over to my keeping at once. To take away any taste she might have for looking at my notes or prying into my private affairs, I often used to express my disapproval of bold and forward females who try too hard to know about things outside the house and about the concerns of their husband and of men in general....

[Husbands] who take counsel with their wives... are madmen if they think true prudence or good counsel lies in the female brain.... For this very reason I have always tried carefully not to let any secret of mine be known to a woman. I did not doubt that my wife was most loving, and more discreet and modest in her ways than any, but I still considered it safer to have her unable, and not merely unwilling, to harm me.... Furthermore, I made it a rule never to speak with her of anything but household matters or questions of conduct, or of the children. Of these matters I spoke a good deal to her....

When my wife had seen and understood the place of everything in the house, I said to her, ‘My dear wife... you have seen our treasures now, and thanks be to God they are such that we ought to be contented with them. If we know how to preserve them, these things will serve you and me and our children. It is up to you, therefore, my dear wife, to keep no less careful watch over them than I.’

... She said she would be happy to do conscientiously whatever she knew how to do and had the skill to do, hoping it might please me. To this I said, ‘Dear wife, listen to me. I shall be most pleased if you do just three things: first, my wife, see that you never want another man to share this bed but me. You understand.’ She blushed and cast down her eyes. Still I repeated that she should never receive anyone into that room but myself. That was the first point. The second, I said, was that she should take care of the household, preside over it with modesty, serenity, tranquillity, and peace. That was the second point. The third thing, I said, was that she should see that nothing went wrong in the house.

... I could not describe to you how reverently she replied to me. She said her mother had taught her only how to spin and sew, and how to be virtuous and obedient. Now she would gladly learn from me how to rule the family and whatever I might wish to teach her.

Then she and I knelt down and prayed to God to give us the power to make good use of those possessions which he, in his mercy and kindness, had allowed us to enjoy. We also prayed... that he might grant us the grace to live together in peace and harmony for many happy years, and with many male children, and that he might grant to me riches, friendship, and honor, and to her, integrity, purity, and the character of a perfect mistress of the household. Then, when we had stood up, I said to her: ‘My dear wife, to have prayed God for these things is not enough.... I shall seek with all my powers to gain what we have asked of God. You, too, must set your whole will, all your mind, and all your modesty to work to make yourself a person whom God has heard.... You should realize that in this regard nothing is so important for yourself, so acceptable to God, so pleasing to me, and precious in the sight of your children as your chastity. The woman’s character is the jewel of her family; the mother’s purity has always been a part of the dowry she passes on to her daughters; her purity has always far outweighed her beauty.... Shun every sort of dishonor, my dear wife. Use every means to appear to all people as a highly respectable woman. To seem less would be to offend God, me, our children, and yourself.’
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... Never, at any moment, did I choose to show in word or action even the least bit of self-surrender in front of my wife. I did not imagine for a moment that I could hope to win obedience from one to whom I had confessed myself a slave. Always, therefore, I showed myself virile and a real man.

**Question:**
1. What does the Florentine merchant expect of his wife?
9.1 The Flagellants

Although flagellation (voluntary whipping) had been practiced in monastic communities long before, it does not emerge as a public group activity until the mid-thirteenth century. When Europe experienced the Black Death (1347–1350), the Brotherhood of Flagellants (it included women also) resorted to even more spectacular public flagellation. The movement probably originated in Eastern Europe and took root most deeply in German areas. As we see from the following report of Robert of Avesbury, however, they also crossed the English Channel.


About Michaelmas 1349 over six hundred men came to London from Flanders, mostly of Zeeland and Holland origin. Sometimes at St. Paul’s and sometimes at other points in the city they made two daily public appearances wearing cloths from the thighs to the ankles, but otherwise stripped bare. Each wore a cap marked with a red cross in front and behind. Each had in his right hand a scourge with three tails. Each tail had a knot and though the middle of it there were sometimes sharp nails fixed. They marched naked in a file one behind the other and whipped themselves with these scourges on their naked and bleeding bodies. Four of them would chant in their native tongue and another four would chant in response like a litany. Thrice they would all cast themselves on the ground in this sort of procession, stretching out their hands like the arms of a cross. The singing would go on and, the one who was in the rear of those thus prostrate acting first, each of them in turn would step over the others and give one stroke with his scourge to the man lying under him. This went on from the first to the last until each of them had observed the ritual to the full tale of those on the ground. Then each put on his customary garments and always wearing their caps and carrying their whips in their hands they retired to their lodgings. It is said that every night they performed the same penance.

Questions:
1. What was the motivation behind the flagellant movement?
2. Why do you think most church authorities discouraged such activities? Why do you think secular and church authorities allowed them to continue?
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9.2 Propositions of Wycliffe condemned at London, 1382, and at the Council of Constance, 1415

John Wycliffe (c. 1328–1384) taught theology and philosophy at Oxford and was a forceful advocate of church reform. He believed that the Bible was the highest spiritual authority and that the sacraments of the church were not necessary for salvation. The fact that he preached these beliefs in public and in English led to his condemnation as a heretic. He was not, however, executed but rather forced into retirement from public life.


I. 2 That the material substance of bread and the material substance of wine remain in the Sacrament of the altar.
2. That the accidents of bread do not remain without a subject (substance) in the said Sacrament.
3. That Christ is not in the Sacrament essentially and really, in his own corporeal presence.
4. That if a bishop or priest be in mortal sin he does not ordain, consecrate or baptize.
5. That it is not laid down in the Gospel that Christ ordained the Mass.
6. That God ought to obey the devil.1
7. That if a man be duly penitent any outward confession is superfluous and useless.
10. That it is contrary to Holy Scripture that ecclesiastics should have possessions.
14. That any deacon or priest may preach the word of God apart from the authority of the Apostolic See or a Catholic bishop.
15. That no one is civil lord, or prelate, or bishop, while he is in mortal sin.
16. That temporal lords can at their will take away temporal goods from the church, when those who hold them are sinful (habitually sinful, not sinning in one act only).
17. That the people can at their own will correct sinful lords.
18. That tithes are mere alms, and that parishioners can withdraw them at their will because of the misdeeds of their curates.
20. That he who gives alms to friars is by that fact excommunicate.
21. That any one who enters a private religion (i.e. religious house), either of those having property or of mendicants, is rendered more inapt and unfit for the performance of the commands of God.
22. That holy men have sinned in founding private religions.
23. That the religious who live in private religions are not of the Christian religion.
24. That friars are bound to gain their livelihood by the labour of their hands, and not by begging.
28. That the confirmation of young men, the ordination of clerics, the consecration of places are reserved for the Pope and bishops on account of the desire for temporal gain and honour.
30. That the excommunication of the Pope or of any prelate is not to be feared, because it is the censure of antichrist.
34. That all of the order of mendicants are heretics.
35. That the Roman Church is the synagogue of Satan, and the Pope is not the next and immediate vicar of Christ and the Apostles.
42. That it is fatuous to believe in the indulgences of the Pope and the bishops.
43. That all oaths made to corroborate human contracts and civil business are unlawful.

Question:
1. Why were the ideas of Wycliffe so odious to the Church?

---

2The propositions are numbered as at Constance. Fasc. Ziz. give a different order.
1 i.e. `Dominion by grace` cannot be put into operation in the world as it is.
9.3 The Lollard Conclusions, 1394

Wycliffe’s condemnation did not stop his followers, known as Lollards, from spreading his ideas. One of their chief accomplishments was the translation of the Bible from Latin into English. Many historians see the Lollard movement as a precursor to Protestantism.


1. That when the Church of England began to go mad after temporalities, like its great step-mother the Roman Church, and churches were authorized by appropriation in divers places, faith, hope, and charity began to flee from our Church, because pride, with its doleful progeny of moral sins, claimed this under title of truth. This conclusion is general, and proved by experience, custom, and manner or fashion, as you shall afterwards hear.

2. That our usual priesthood which began in Rome, pretended to be of power more lofty than the angels, is not that priesthood which Christ ordained for His apostles. This conclusion is proved because the Roman priesthood is bestowed with signs, rites, and pontifical blessings, of small virtue, nowhere exemplified in Holy Scripture, because the bishop’s ordinal and the New Testament scarcely agree, and we cannot see that the Holy Spirit, by reason of any such signs, confers the gift, for He and all His excellent gifts cannot consist in any one with mortal sin. A corollary to this is that it is a grievous play for wise men to see bishops trifle with the Holy Spirit in the bestowal for orders, because they give the tonsure in outward appearance in the place of white hearts; and this is the unrestrained introduction of antichrist into the Church to give colour to idleness.

3. That the law of continence enjoined on priests, which was first ordained to the prejudice of women, brings sodomy into all the Holy Church, but we excuse ourselves by the Bible because the decree says that we should not mention it, though suspected. Reason and experience prove this conclusion: reason, because the good living of ecclesiastics must have a natural outlet or worse; experience, because the secret proof of such men is that they find delight in women, and when thou hast proved such a man mark him well, because he is one of them. A corollary to this is that private religions and the originators or beginning of this sin would be specially worthy of being checked, but God of His power with regard to secret sin sends open vengeance in His Church.

4. That the pretended miracle of the sacrament of bread drives all men, but a few, to idolatry, because they think that the Body of Christ which is never away from heaven could by power of the priest’s word be enclosed essentially in a little bread which they show the people; but God grant that they might be willing to believe what the evangelical doctor says in his Trialogus (iv. 7), that the bread of the altar is habitually the Body of Christ, for we take it that in this way any faithful man and woman can by God’s law perform the sacrament of that bread without any such miracle. A final corollary is that although the Body of Christ has been granted eternal joy, the service of Corpus Christi, instituted by Brother Thomas [Aquinas], is not true but is fictitious and full of false miracles. It is no wonder; because Brother Thomas, at that time holding with the pope, would have been willing to perform a miracle with a hen’s egg: and we know well that any falsehood openly preached turns to the disgrace of Him who is always true and without any defect.

5. That exorcisms and blessings performed over wine, bread, water and oil, salt, wax, and incense, the stones of the altar, and church walls, over clothing, mitre, cross, and pilgrims’ staves, are the genuine performance of necromancy rather than of sacred theology. This conclusion is proved as follows, because by such exorcisms creatures are honoured as being of higher virtue than they are in their own nature, and we do not see any change in any creature which is so exorcized, save by false faith which is the principal characteristic of the Devil’s art. A corollary: that if the book of exorcising holy water, read in church, were entirely trustworthy we think truly that the holy water used in church would be the best medicine for all kinds of illnesses—sores, for instance; whereas we experience the contrary day by day.

6. That king and bishop in one person, prelate and judge in temporal causes, curate and officer in secular office, puts any kingdom beyond good rule. This conclusion is clearly proved because the temporal and spiritual are two halves of the entire Holy Church. And so he who has applied himself to one should not meddle with the other, for no one can serve two masters. It seems that hermaphrodite or ambidexter would be good names for such men of double estate. A corollary is that we, the procurators of God in this behalf, do petition before Parliament that all curates, as well superior as inferior, be fully excused and should occupy themselves with their own charge and no other.

---

1 Alborum cervorum = ‘white harts’!
7. That special prayers for the souls of the dead offered in our Church, preferring one before another in name, are a false foundation of alms, and for that reason all houses of alms in England have been wrongly founded. This conclusion is proved by two reasons: the one is that meritorious prayer, and of any effect, ought to be a work proceeding from deep charity, and perfect charity leaves out no one, for ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.’ And so it is clear to us that the gift of temporal good bestowed on the priesthood and houses of alms is a special incentive to private prayer which is not far from simony. For another reason is that special prayer made for men condemned is very displeasing to God. And although it be doubtful, it is probable to faithful Christian people that founders of a house of alms have for their poisonous endowment passed over for the most part to the broad road. The corollary is: effectual prayer springing from perfect love would in general embrace all whom God would have saved, and would do away with that well-worn way or merchandise in special prayers made for the possessionary mendicants and other hired priests, who are a people of great burden to the whole realm, kept in idleness: for it has been proved in one book, which the king had, that a hundred houses of alms would suffice in all the realm, and from this would rather accrue precious profit to the temporal estate.

8. That pilgrimages, prayers, and offerings made to blind crosses or roods, and to deaf images of wood or stone, are pretty well akin to idolatry and far from alms, and although these be forbidden and imaginary, a book of error to the lay folk, still the customary image of the Trinity is specially abominable. This conclusion God clearly proves, bidding alms to be done to the needy man because they are the image of God, and more like than wood or stone; for God did not say, ‘let us make wood or stone in our likeness and image,’ but man; because the supreme honour which clerks call latria appertains to the Godhead only; and the lower honour which clerks call dulia appertains to man and angel and to no inferior creature. A corollary is that the service of the cross, performed twice in any year in our church, is full of idolatry, for if that should, so might the nails and lance be so highly honoured; then would the lips of Judas be relics indeed if any were able to possess them. But we ask you, pilgrim, to tell us when you offer to the bones of saints placed in a shrine in any spot, if that should, so might the nails and lance be so highly honoured; then would the lips of Judas be relics indeed if any were able to possess them.

9. That auricular confession which is said to be so necessary to the salvation of a man, with its pretended power of absolution, exalts the arrogance of priests and gives them opportunity of other secret colloquies which we will not speak of; for both lords and ladies attest that, for fear of their confessors, they dare not speak the truth. And at the time of confession there is a ready occasion for assignation, that is for ‘wooing,’ and other secret understandings leading to mortal sins. They themselves say that they are God’s representatives to judge of every sin, to pardon and cleanse whomsoever they please. They say that they have the keys of heaven and of hell, and can excommunicate and bless, bind and loose, at their will, so much so that for a drink, or twelve pence, they will sell the blessing of heaven with charter and close warrant sealed with the common seal. This conclusion is so notorious that it needs not any proof. It is a corollary that the pope of Rome, who has given himself out as treasurer of the whole Church, having in charge that worthy jewel of Christ’s passion together with the merits of all saints in heaven, whereby he grants pretended indulgence from penalty and guilt, is a treasurer almost devoid of charity, in that he can set free all that are prisoners in hell at his will, and cause that they should never come to that place. But in this any Christian can well see there is much secret falsehood hidden away in our Church.

10. That manslaughter in war, or by pretended law of justice for a temporal cause, without spiritual revelation, is expressly contrary to the New Testament, which indeed is the law of grace and full of mercies. This conclusion is openly proved by the examples of Christ’s preaching here on earth, for he specially taught a man to love his enemies, and to show them pity, and not to slay them. The reason is this, that for the most part, when men fight, after the first blow, charity is broken. And whoever dies without charity goes the straight road to hell. And beyond this we know well that no clergymen can by Scripture or lawful reason remit the punishment of death for one mortal sin and not for another; but the law of mercy, which is the New Testament, prohibits all manner of manslaughter, for in the Gospel: ‘It was said unto them of old time, Thou shalt not kill.’ The corollary is that it is indeed robbery of poor folk when lords get indulgences from punishment and guilt for those who aid their army to kill a Christian people in distant lands for temporal gain, just as we too have seen soldiers who run into heathendom to get them a name for the slaughter of men; much more do they deserve ill thanks from the King of Peace, for by our humility and patience was the faith multiplied, and Christ Jesus hates and threatens men who fight and kill, when He says: ‘He who smites with the sword shall perish by the sword.’

11. That the vow of continence made in our Church by women who are frail and imperfect in nature, is the cause of bringing in the gravest horrible sins possible to human nature, because, although the killing of abortive children before they are baptized and the destruction of nature by drugs are vile sins, yet connection with themselves or brute beasts of any creature not having fife surpasses them in foulness to such an extent as that they should be punished with the pains of hell. The corollary is that, widows and such as take the veil and the ring, being delicately fed, we could wish that they were not a case of martyrdom. And at the time of whom men call St Thomas, were not a case of martyrdom.
12. That the abundance of unnecessary arts practised in our realm nourishes much sin in waste, profusion, and disguise. This, experience and reason prove in some measure, because nature is sufficient for a man’s necessity with few arts. The corollary is that since St Paul says: ‘having food and raiment, let us be therewith content,’ it seems to us that goldsmiths and armourers and all kinds of arts not necessary for a man, according to the apostle, should be destroyed for the increase of virtue; because although these two said arts were exceedingly necessary in the old law, the New Testament abolishes them and many others.

This is our embassy, which Christ has bidden us fulfil, very necessary for this time for several reasons. And although these matters are briefly noted here they are however set forth at large in another book, and many others besides, at length in our own language, and we wish that these were accessible to all Christian people. We ask God then of His supreme goodness to reform our Church, as being entirely out of joint, to the perfectness of its first beginning.

[Foxe’s translation of some contemporary verses added to the foregoing document]
The English nation doth lament of these vile men their sin,
Which Paul doth plainly dignify by idols to begin.
But Gehazites full ingrate from sinful Simon sprung,
This to defend, though priests in name, make bulwarks great and strong.
Ye princes, therefore, whom to rule the people God hath placed
With justice’ sword, why see ye not this evil great defaced?

**Question:**
1. How do the Lollards carry the ideas of Wycliffe even further?
9.4 Individual Heretics: Saints and Witches

In the later middle ages (from the fourteenth century on) many changes rocked society, including the devastating mortality of the Black Death, rural migration to cities, disruption in the Church, new technology, discoveries, and ideas. Increasing uncertainty placed marginal people at further risk and made everyone more suspicious of others who threatened the accepted order and authority. The following two accounts reveal how some people were condemned in Florence for such dubious behavior or beliefs.


THE EXECUTION OF FRA MICHELE OF CALCI, 1389

[April 30, 1389] This is the condemnation of Giovanni, called Fra Michele di Berti of Calci, in the territory of Pisa, a man of low condition, evil conversation, life, and reputation, and a heretic against the Catholic faith, against whom we have proceeded by means of inquisition.... It has come to our attention that this Giovanni... with the spirit and intent of being a heretic, had relations with the Fraticelli, called the Little Brothers of Poverty, heretics and schismatics and denounced by the Holy Roman Church, and that he joined that depraved sect in a place called the grotto of the Dieci Yoffensi, in which place they congregated and stayed.... With the intention of proclaiming this heresy and of contaminating faithful Christians, the accused came to the city of Florence and in public places he did maintain, affirm, and preach the heretical teachings hereby stated:

Item, that Christ, our Redeemer, possessed no property either individually or in common but divested himself of all things, as the Holy Scripture testifies.

Item, that Christ and his Apostles, according to the Scriptures, denounced the taking, holding, or exchanging of goods as against divine law.

Item, that Pope John XXII [d. 1334] of blessed memory was a heretic and lost all power and ecclesiastical authority as pope and as a heretic had no authority to appoint bishops or prelates, and that all prelates so appointed by him do not legally hold their office and that they sin by pretending to do so.

Item, that all cardinals, prelates, and clerics who accepted the teaching of John XXII on apostolic poverty, and who should resist these teachings and who do not resist, are also heretics and have lost all authority as priests of Christ.

Item, that this Giovanni, a heretic and schismatic, not content with all this mentioned above, but desiring also the damnation of others, in the months of March and April sought to persuade many men and women of the city of Florence, to induce them to believe inland to enter the above-mentioned sect of the Fraticelli. He told them about the above-mentioned sect; with false words and with erroneous reasons he claimed that this sect was the true religion and the true observance of the rule and life of the blessed Francis; and that all those who observe this doctrine and life are in a state of grace, and that all other friars and priests are heretics and schismatics and are damned.

And since this Giovanni appeared before us and our court and confessed to the above-mentioned charges... and refused to recant or to reject these teachings, we hereby decree that unless this Giovanni gives up his false teaching and beliefs, that as an example to others, he be taken to the place of justice and there he is to be burned with fire and the flames of fire so that he shall die and his spirit be separated from his body.

Now everything which I here describe, I who write both saw or heard. Fra Michele, having come into the courtyard, waited attentively to hear the condemnation. And the vicar [general of the bishop] spoke: “The bishop and the Inquisitor have sent me here to tell you that if you wish to return to the Holy Church and renounce your errors, then do so, in order that the people may see that the church is merciful.” And Fra Michele replied, “I believe in the poor crucified Christ, and I believe that Christ, showing the way to perfection, possessed nothing....” Having read his confession, the judge turned his back upon Fra Michele... and the guards seized him and with great force pushed him outside of the gate of the judge’s palace. He remained there alone, surrounded by scoundrels, appearing in truth as one of the martyrs. And there was such a great crowd that one could scarcely see. And the throng increased in size, shouting: “You don’t want to die!” And Fra Michele replied, “I will die for Christ.” And the crowd answered: “Oh! You aren’t dying for Christ! You don’t believe in God!” And Fra Michele replied: “I believe in God, in the Virgin Mary, and in the Holy Church!” And someone said to him, “You wretch! The devil is pushing you from behind!!"
And when he arrived in the district of the Proconsolo, there was a great press of people who came to watch. And one of the faithful cried: “Fra Michele! Pray to God for us....” When he arrived at S. Giovanni, they shouted to him: “Repent, repent! You don’t want to die.” And he said:

“I have repented of my sins....” And at the Mercato Vecchio, they shouted even louder: “Save yourself! Save yourself!” And he replied, “Save yourselves from damnation.” And at the Mercato Nuovo, the shouts grew louder:

“Repent, repent!” And he replied, “Repent of your sins; repent of your usury and your false merchandising....And at the Piazza del Grano, there were many women in the windows of the houses who cried to him: “Repent, repent!” And he replied, “Repent of your sins, your usury, your gambling, your fornication....” When he arrived at S. Croce, near the gate of the friars, the image of St. Francis was shown to him and he raised his eyes to heaven and said, “St. Francis, my father, pray to Christ for me.”

And then moving toward the gate of Justice, the crowd cried in unison: “Recant, recant! You don’t want to die!” And he replied, “Christ died for us.” And some said to him, mocking: “Ho, you’re not Christ and you don’t have to die for us.” And he replied, “I wish to die for Him.” And then another shouted, “Ho, you’re not among pagans,” and he answered, “I wish to die for the truth....

And when he arrived at the gate near the place of execution, one of the faithful began to cry, “Remain firm, martyr of Christ, for soon you will receive the crown....” And arriving at the place of execution, there was a great turmoil and the crowd urged him to repent and save himself and he refused.... And the guards pushed the crowd back and formed a circle of horsemen around the pyre so that no one could enter. I myself did not enter but climbed upon the river bank to see, but I was unable to hear.... And he was bound to the stake... and the crowd begged him to recant, except one of the faithful, who comforted him. And they set fire to the wood... and Fra Michele began to recite the Te Deum.... And when he had said, “In your hands, 0 Lord, I commend my spirit,” the fire burned the cords which bound him and he fell dead... to the earth.

And many of the onlookers said, “He seems to be a saint.” Even his enemies whispered it... and then they slowly began to return to their homes. They talked about Michele and the majority said that he was wrong and that no one should speak such evil of the priests. And some said, “He is a martyr,” and others said, “He is a saint,” and still others denied it. And there was a greater tumult and disturbance in Florence than there had ever been.

CONDEMNATION OF A WITCH (JUNE 7, 1427)

...We condemn... Giovanna called Caterina, daughter of Francesco called El Tosco, a resident of the parish of S. Ambrogio of Florence... who is a magician, witch, and sorceress, and a practitioner of the black arts.

It happened that Giovanni Ceresani of the parish of S. Jacopo tra le Fosse was passing by her door and stared at her fixedly. She thought that she would draw the chaste spirit of Giovanni to her for carnal purposes by means of the black arts.... She went to the shop of Monna Gilia, the druggist, and purchased from her a small amount of lead... and then she took a bowl and placed the lead in it and put it on the fire so that the lead would melt. With this melted lead she made a small chain and spoke certain words which have significance for this magical and diabolical art (and which, lest the people learn about them, shall not be recorded).... All this which was done and spoken against Giovanni’s safety by Giovanna was so powerful that his chaste spirit was deflected to lust after her, so that willynilly he went several times to her house and there he fulfilled her perfidious desire.

With the desire of doing further harm to Giovanni’s health through the black arts, and so persisting in what she had begun, she acquired a little gold, frankincense, and myrrh, and then took a little bowl with some glowing charcoal inside, and having prepared these ingredients and having lit the candle which she held in her left hand, she genuflected before the image and placed the bowl at the foot of the figure. Calling out the name of Giovanni, she threw the gold, frankincense, and myrrh upon the charcoal. And when the smoke from the charcoal covered the whole image, Giovanna spoke certain words, the tenor of which is vile and detestable, and which should be buried in silence lest the people be given information for committing sin.

When she realized that what she had done against Giovanni’s health was not sufficient to satisfy completely her insatiable lust, she learned from a certain priest that... if water from the skulls of dead men was distilled and given with a little wine to any man, that it was a most valid test.... Night and day, that woman thought of nothing but how she could give that water to Giovanni to drink.... She visited the priest and bought from him a small amount of that water... and that accursed woman gave Giovanni that water mixed with wine to drink. After he drank it, Giovanni could think of nothing but satisfying his lust with Giovanna. And his health has been somewhat damaged, in the opinion of good and worthy [men].
In the time when Giovanna was menstruating, she took a little of her menses, that quantity which is required by the diabolical ceremonies, and placed it in a small beaker, and then poured it into another flask filled with wine and gave it to Giovanni to drink. And on account of this and the other things described above, Giovanni no longer has time for his affairs as he did in the past, and he has left his home and his wife and son... And does only what pleases Giovanna....

On several occasions, Giovanna had intercourse with a certain Jacopo di Andrea, a doublet-maker, of the parish of S. Niccolo. Desiring to possess his chaste spirit totally for her lust and against his health, Giovanna... thought to give Jacopo some of her menses, since she knew that it was very efficacious.... Having observed several diabolical rites, she took the beaker with the menses... and gave it to Jacopo to drink. After he had drunk, she uttered these words among others: “I will catch you in my net if you don’t flee.” ... When they were engaged in the act of intercourse, she placed her hand on her private parts... and after uttering certain diabolical words, she put a finger on Jacopo’s lips.... Thereafter, in the opinion of everyone, Jacopo’s health deteriorated and he was forced by necessity to obey her in everything.

Several years ago, Giovanna was the concubine of Niccolo di Ser Casciotto of the parish of S. Giorgio, and she had three children by him. Having a great affection for Niccolo, who was then in Hungary, she wanted him to return to her in Florence.... So she planned a diabolical experiment by invoking a demon, to the detriment of Niccolo’s health.... She went to someone who shall not be identified... and asked him to go to another diabolical woman, a sorceress (whose name shall not be publicized, for the public good), and asked her to make for Giovanna a wax image in the form of a woman, and also some pins and other items required by this diabolical experiment.... Giovanna took that image and placed it in a chest in her house. When, a few days later, she had to leave that house and move to another, she left the image in the chest. Later it was discovered by the residents of that house, who burned it.

She collected nine beans, a piece of cloth, some charcoal, several olive leaves which had been blessed and which stood before the image of the Virgin Mary, a coin with a cross, and a grain of salt. With these in her hand she genuflected... [before the image] and recited three times the Pater Noster and the Ave Maria, spurning the divine prayers composed for the worship of God and his mother the Virgin Mary. Having done this, she placed these items on a piece of linen cloth and slept over them for three nights. And afterwards, she took them in her hand and thrice repeated the Pater Noster and the Ave Maria.... And thus Giovanna knew that her future husband would not love her. And so it happened, for after the celebration and the consummation of the marriage, her husband Giovanni stayed with her for a few days, and then left her and has not yet returned. [Giovanna confessed to these crimes and was beheaded.]

Questions:
1. Why would both church and civil authorities consider Fra Michele’s teachings dangerous while others hailed him as a saint?
2. What role do you think gender played in the accusation and conviction of Giovanna?
3. How could her alleged behavior be considered threatening to the social order?
4. Do you think Giovanna and Giovanni were victims or guilty mischief-makers in Florence?
9.5 How They Died

The following selections are Coroner Reports from the City of London during the fourteenth century. The untimely death of these ordinary townspeople also reveals many details about their everyday lives.


1. ON THE DEATH OF ROBERT, SON OF JOHN DE ST. BOTULPH

Saturday before the Feast of St. Margaret [20 July] in the year [16 Edward II, A.D. 1322], information was given to the... Coroner and Sheriffs that a certain Robert, son of John de St. Botulph, a boy seven years old, lay dead of a death other than his rightful death in a certain shop which the said Robert held of Richard de Wirhale in the parish of St. Michael de Paternosterchurch in the Ward of Vintry. Thereupon the Coroner and Sheriffs proceeded there and, having summoned good men of that Ward and of the three nearest Wards, namely Douuegate, Queenhithe and Cordewannerstreet, they diligently inquired how it happened. The jurors say that when on the Sunday next before the Feast of St. Dunstan [19 May], [Robert son of] John, Richard son of John de Chesthunt, and two other boys, names unknown, were playing on certain pieces of timber in a lane called “Kyrounelane” in the Ward of Vintry, a certain piece fell on [Robert] and broke his right leg. In the course of time Johanna, his mother, arrived, and rolled the timber off him, and carried him to a shop where he lingered until Friday... when he died at the hour of Prime of the broken leg and of no other felony, nor do they suspect anyone of the death, but only the accident and the fracture. Being asked who were present when it happened, they say the aforesaid Robert, Richard son of John de Chesthunt and two boys whose names they know not and no others.

Four neighbors attached, namely:
- Richard Daske, by Peter Cosyn and Roger le Roper.
- Anketin de Gisors, by Robert de Wynton and Andrew de Gloucester.
- Thomas le Roper, by Richard de Colyngstoke and Thomas atte March.
- John Amys, by John de Shirbourne and John de Lincoln.

2. ON THE DEATH OF NICHOLAS, SERVANT OF SIMON DE KNOTTYNGLEY

On Monday in Pentecost week the year [A.D. 1324], it happened that Nicholas, the servant of Simon de Knottyngley, lay killed before the gate of the house of William de Pomfreit in the high street in the parish of St. Botulph de Bisshopsgate.... On hearing this, the... Coroner and Sheriffs proceeded there, and having summoned good men of that Ward and of the three nearest Wards..., they diligently inquired how it happened. The jurors say that on that Monday, at break of day, William de la March, the late palfrey-man [a type of groom] of Henry de Percy, Thomas the servant of Henry de Percy’s cook, John the servant to Henry Krok, who was Henry’s esquire, assaulted, beat and wounded Nicholas in the house held by Alice de Witteney, a courtesan, whose landlord was John de Assheby.... William de la March struck Nicholas with a knife called an “Irishknife” under the right breast and penetrating to the belly, inflicting a wound an inch long and in depth half through the body. [Nicholas] thus wounded went from there to the place where he was found dead, where he died at daybreak of the same day. Being asked what became of the said William, Thomas and John, the jurors say that they immediately fled, but where they went or who received them they know not, nor do they suspect any one except those three. Being asked as to their goods and chattels, the jurors say that they had none, so far as could be ascertained. Being asked who first found the corpse, they say it was Thomas, son of John le Marshall, who raised the cry so that the country came. The corpse was viewed on which the wound appeared. [Order] to the Sheriff to attach the said William, Thomas and John as soon as they be found in their bailiwick.
Afterwards the William de la March was captured by Adam de Salisbury, the Sheriff and committed to Newgate [prison]. William has a surcoat which is confiscated [because of] his flight, worth two shillings, for which Adam de Salisbury the Sheriff [is responsible].

Four neighbors attached, namely:
John Assheby, by Thomas Starling and Walter de Stanes.
Walter de Bedefunte, by Walter de Northampton and John le Barber.
William de Pomfreit, by William de Chalke and Roger Swetyng.
Adam le Fuitz Robert, by Eustace le Hattere and Thomas de Borham.

3. **ON THE DEATH OF THOMAS LE POUNTAGER**

On Saturday the Feast of St. Laurence [10 Aug.] the year [A.D. 1325], it happened that a certain Thomas, son of John le Pountager, lay drowned in the water of the Thames before the wharf of Richard Dorking in the parish of St. Martin, in the Ward of Vintry. On hearing this, the Coroner and Sheriffs proceeded there, and having summoned good men of that Ward and of the three nearest Wards... they diligently inquired how it happened. The jurors say that when on the preceding Friday, at dusk, Thomas had placed himself on the quay of Edward le Blount to bathe in the Thames, he was accidentally drowned, no one being present; that he remained in the water until Saturday, when at the third hour John Fleg a boatman discovered his corpse and raised the cry so that the country came. The corpse viewed on which no wound or bruise appeared.

The above John Fleg, the finder of the body, attached by Robert de Lenne and Robert de Taunton.
Four neighbors attached [their names are listed in the report].

4. **ON THE DEATH OF JOHANNA, DAUGHTER OF BERNARD OF IRLAUNDE**

Friday after the Feast of St. Dunstan [19 May] the year [A.D. 1322], it happened that Johanna daughter of Bernard de Irlaunde, a child one month old, lay dead of a death other than her rightful death, in a shop held by the said Bernard... in the parish of St. Michael, in the Ward of Queenhithe. On hearing this, the Coroner and Sheriffs proceeded there, and having summoned good men of that Ward and of the three nearest Wards..., they diligently inquired how it happened. The jurors say that when on the preceding Thursday, before the hour of Vespers, Johanna was lying in her cradle alone, the shop door being open there entered a certain sow which mortally bit the right side of the head of Johanna. At length there came Margaret, Johanna’s mother, and raised the cry and snatched up Johanna and kept her alive until midnight Friday when she died of the said bite and of no other felony. Being asked who were present, [the jurors] say, “No one except Margaret,” nor do they suspect [any other cause] except the bite, the corpse of the said Johanna viewed on which no [other?] hurt appeared [sic]. The sow appraised by the jurors at 13 d. for which Richard Costantin, the Sheriff; [is responsible].

The above Margaret who found the body attached by John de Bedford and Andrew de Gloucester.
Four neighbors attached [their names are listed in the report].

5. **ON THE DEATH OF MATILDA LA CAMBESTER AND MARGERY HER DAUGHTER**

Friday after the Feast of St. Ambrose [4 April, 1337], information given to the Coroner and Sheriffs, that Matilda la Cambester and Margery her daughter aged one month, lay dead of a death other than their rightful death in a shop in the rent of the Prior of Tortyton in the parish of St Swythin in the Ward of Walbrok. Thereupon they proceeded there, and having summoned good men of that Ward, they diligently inquired how it happened. The jurors... say that on the preceding Thursday, after the hour of curfew when Matilda and Margery lay asleep in the shop a lighted candle which Matilda had negligently left on the wall, fell down among some straw and set fire to the shop so that the said Matilda and Margery were suffocated and burnt before the neighbors knew anything about it. The bodies viewed, &c.

Four neighbors attached [their names are listed in the report].

6. **ON THE DEATH OF LUCY FAUKES**

On Monday before the Feast of St. Michael [29 Sept., 1322], it happened that a certain Lucy Faukes lay dead of a death other than her rightful death in a certain shop which Richard le Sherman held of John Priour, senior, in the parish of St. Olave in the Ward of Alegate. On hearing this, the Coroner and Sheriffs proceeded thither, and having summoned good men of that Ward and of the three nearest Wards, ... they diligently inquired how it happened. The jurors say that on Sunday before the Feast of St. Matthew [2 Sept., 1322], about the hour of curfew, Lucy came to the shop in order to pass the night there with... Richard le Sherman and Cristina his wife, as she oftentimes was accustomed, and because Lucy was clad in good clothes, Richard and Cristina began to quarrel with her in order to obtain a reason for killing her for her clothes. At
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length Robert took up a staff called ‘Balstaf;’ and with the force and assistance of Cristina, struck her on the top of the head, and mortally broke and crushed the whole of her head, so that she died at once. Richard and Cristina stripped Lucy of her clothes, and immediately fled, but where they went or who received them, [the jurors] do not know. Being asked who were present when this happened, they say, “No one except the said Richard, Cristina and Lucy.” Nor do they suspect anyone of the death except Richard and Cristina. Being asked about the goods and chattels of Richard and Cristina, the jurors say that they had nothing except what they took away with them. Being asked who found the dead Lucy’s dead body, they say a certain Giles le Portor who raised the cry so that the country came. Order to the Sheriffs to attach the said Richard and Cristina when found in their bailiwick.

... Four neighbors attached [their names are listed in the report].

Questions:
1. What role do members of the community have in the event of “a death other than a rightful death?”
2. What do these reports inform us about the living conditions in the city of London?
3. What do they reveal about the roles of male and female among working urban dwellers?
Part 9: The Late Middle Ages

9.6 Workers Revolt: The Demands of the Ciompi

The demographic disaster of the Black Death (1347–1350) and economic troubles of the fourteenth century deeply disturbed the social stability of Europe. Workers and peasants revolted against the ruling elites across Europe. In 1378 an urban revolt broke out in Florence, Italy. The revolutionaries, the Ciompi issued their demands to the Florentine Republic that was dominated by an oligarchy of wealthy merchants. Although concessions were initially granted, by 1382, the reforms were rescinded.


[July 21, 1378] When the popolo and the guildsmen had seized the palace [of the podestá], they sent a message to the Signoria... that they wished to make certain demands by means of petitions, which were just and reasonable.... They said that, for the peace and repose of the city, they wanted certain things which they had decided among themselves... and they begged the priors to have them read, and then to deliberate on them, and to present them to their colleges.

The first chapter [of the petition] stated that the Lana guild1 would no longer have a [police] official of the guild. Another was that the combers, carders, trimmers, washers, and other cloth workers would have their own [guild] consuls, and would no longer be subject to the Lana guild.

Another chapter [stated that] the Commune’s funded debt would no longer pay interest, but the capital would be restored [to the shareholders] within twelve years.

Another chapter was that all outlaws and those who had been condemned by the Commune... except rebels and traitors would be pardoned. Moreover, all penalties involving a loss of a limb would be cancelled, and those who were condemned would pay a money fine.... Furthermore, for two years none of the poor people could be prosecuted for debts of 50 florins or less. For a period of six months, no forced loans were to be levied.... And within that six months’ period, a schedule for levying direct taxes [estimo] was to be compiled....

The popolo entered the palace and [the podestá] departed, without any harm being done to him. They ascended the bell tower and placed there the emblem of the blacksmiths’ guild, that is, the tongs. Then the banners of the other guilds, both great and small, were unfurled from the windows of the [palace of] the podestá, and also the standard of justice, but there was no flag of the Lana guild. Those inside the palace threw out and burned... every document which they found. And they remained there, all that day and night, in honor of God. Both rich and poor were there, each one to protect the standard of his guild.

The next morning the popolo brought the standard of justice from the palace and they marched, all armed, to the Piazza della Signoria, shouting: “Long live the popolo minuto!”.... Then they began to cry “that the Signoria should leave, and if they didn’t wish to depart, they would be taken to their homes.” Into the piazza came a certain Michele di Lando, a wool-comber, who was the son of Monna Simona, who sold provisions to the prisoners in the Stinche... and he was seized and the standard of justice placed in his hands.... Then the popolo ordered the priors to abandon the palace. It was well furnished with supplies necessary [for defense] but they were frightened men and they left [the palace], which was the best course. Then the popolo entered, taking with them the standard of justice... and they entered all the rooms and they found many ropes which [the authorities] had bought to hang the poor people.... Several young men climbed the bell tower and rang the bells to signal the victory which they had won in seizing the palace, in God’s honor. Then they decided to do everything necessary to fortify themselves and to liberate the popolo minuto. Then they acclaimed the woolcomber, Michele di Lando, as signore and standard-bearer of justice, and he was signore for two days.... Then [the popolo] decided to call other priors who would be good comrades and who would fill up the office of those priors who had been expelled. And so by acclamation, they named eight priors and the Twelve and the [Sixteen] standard-bearers.

When they wished to convene a council, these priors called together the colleges and the consuls of the guilds.... This council enacted a decree that everyone who had been proscribed as a Ghibelline since 1357 was to be restored to Guelf status2.... And this was done to give a part to more people, and so that each would be content, and each would have a share of the offices, and so that all of the citizens would be united. Thus poor men would have their due, for they have always borne the expenses [of government], and only the rich have profited.

---

1 The Lana Guild is the Wool Guild dominated by the wool merchants.
2 These were the two chief political groups fighting for control of the Florentine Republic.
... And they deliberated to expand the lower guilds, and where there had been fourteen, there would now be se-
venteen, and thus they would be stronger, and this was done. The first new guild comprised those who worked in the 
woolen industry: factors, brokers in wool and in thread, workers who were employed in the dye shops and the stretching 
sheds, menders, sorters, shearers, beaters, combers, and weavers. These were all banded together, some nine thousand 
men.... The second new guild was made up of dyers, washers, carders, and makers of combs.... In the third guild were 
menders, trimmers, stretchers, washers, shirtmakers, tailors, stocking-makers, and makers of flags.... So all together, the 
lower guilds increased by some thirteen thousand men.

The lord priors and the colleges decided to burn the old Communal scrutiny lists, and this was done. Then a new 
scrutiny was held. The Offices were divided as follows: the [seven] greater guilds had three priors; the fourteen [lower] 
guilds had another three, and the three new guilds had three priors. And so a new scrutiny was completed, which satisfied 
many who had never before had any share of the offices, and had always borne the expenses.

Questions:
1. Who were the workers who made up the Ciompi?
2. What were their demands for changes in the guilds and the government?
PART 10
The Renaissance

10.1 Petrarch: Rules for the Ruler

Petrarch (1304–74) was one of the first humanists who made his living as a public writer, receiving patronage from the wealthy political leaders of the Italian city-states. His concerns, more than his medieval predecessors, were secular, though he did not entirely ignore religion, especially later in life. In this excerpt, he duly praises his patron and then speaks more generally about how one ought to rule a state. Like Dante a generation before him, he used the vernacular and helped to make Italian a literary language.


You ruled with such competence and such maturity that no rumor, no hint of rebellion, disturbed the city in that time of great change. Next, after a short time, you transformed into a large surplus the enormous deficit that debts to foreign powers had left in your treasury. And now the years and experience in government have so matured you that you are esteemed as an outstanding lord, not only by your own citizens but also by the lords of many other cities, who hold you up as a model. As a result, I have often heard neighboring peoples express the wish that they could be governed by you and nurture envy for your subjects. You have never devoted yourself to either the arrogance of pompous display or to the idleness of pleasure, but you have devoted yourself to just rule so that everyone acknowledges that you are peaceful without being feckless and dignified without being proudful. As a result, modesty coexists with magnanimity in your character. You are thus full of dignity. Although, because of your incredible humanity, you permit easy access to yourself even to the most humble, still one of your most outstanding acts is to have at the same time contracted for your daughters very advantageous marriages with noble families in distant lands.1 And you have been, above all other rulers, a lover of public order and peace—a peace that was never thought possible by the citizen-body when Padua was ruled by a communal regime or by any of your family, no matter how long they held the power—you alone constructed many strong fortresses at suitable points along the Paduan frontiers. Thus you acted in every way so that the citizens felt free and secure with you as a ruler, and no innocent blood was spilled. You also have pacified all your neighbors either by fear or by love or by admiration for your excellence, so that for many years now you have ruled a flourishing state with serene tranquility and in continual peace. But at last the adversary of the human race, that enemy of peace [the Devil], suddenly stirred up a dangerous war with that power you never feared. Consequently, although you still loved peace, you fought with Venice bravely and with great determination over a long time, even though you lacked the aid from allies that you had hoped for. And when it seemed most advantageous to do so, you skillfully concluded peace so that at one stroke you won twofold praise both for your bravery and your political wisdom.2 From these facts and from many others I shall omit, you have been viewed as vastly superior to all other rulers of your state and to all rulers of other cities, not only in the judgment of your own subjects but indeed in the opinion of the whole world as well.

The first quality is that a lord should be friendly, never terrifying, to the good citizens, even though it is inevitable that he be terrifying to evil citizens if he is to be a friend to justice. “For he does not carry a sword without good cause, since he is a minister of God,” as the Apostle says. Now nothing is more foolish, nothing is more destructive to the stability of the state, than to wish to be dreaded by everyone. Many princes, both in antiquity and in modern times, have wanted nothing more than to be feared and have believed that nothing is more useful than fear and cruelty in maintaining

1 Francesco da Carrara contracted marriages for several of his daughters with the scions of noble houses in Italy and Germany, including the count of Oettingen, the count of Veglie, and the duke of Saxony.

2 An allusion to the border war fought with Venice in 1372–73, which Francesco da Carrara ended by agreeing to the payment of an indemnity to Venice while he maintained substantially his original frontiers. See Paolo Sambin, “La guerra del 1372–73 tra Venezia e Padova,” Archivio Veneto ser., 38–41 (1946–47):1–76.
their power. Concerning this belief we have an example in the case of the barbaric emperor named Maximinus. In fact, nothing is farther from the truth than these opinions; rather, it is much more advantageous to be loved than to be feared, unless we are speaking of the way in which a devoted child fears a good father. Any other kind of fear is diametrically opposed to what a ruler should desire. Rulers in general want to reign for a long time and to lead their lives in security, but to be feared is opposed to both of these desires, and to be loved is consistent with both.

What I can say is that the nature of public love is the same as private love. Seneca says: “I shall show you a love potion that is made without medicines, without herbs, without the incantations of any poison-maker. If you want to be loved, love.” There it is. Although many other things could be said, this saying is the summation of everything. What is the need for magical arts, what for any reward or labor? Love is free; it is sought out by love alone. And who can be found with such a steely heart that he would not want to return an honorable love? “Honorable” I say, for a dishonorable love is not love at all, but rather hatred hidden under the guise of love. Now to return love to someone who loves basely is to do nothing other than to compound one crime with another and to become a part of another person’s disgraceful deceit.

Indeed, from the discussion of this topic nothing but immense and honorable pleasure ought to come to you since you are so beloved by your subjects that you seem to them to be not a lord over citizens but the “father of your country.” In fact this was the title of almost all of the emperors of antiquity; some of them bore the name justly, but others carried it so unjustly that nothing more perverse can be conceived. Both Caesar Augustus and Nero were called “father of his country.” The first was a true father, the second was an enemy of both his country and of religion. But this title really does belong to you.

You should know, moreover, that to merit this kind of esteem you must always render justice and treat your citizens with goodwill. Do you really want to be a father to your citizens? Then you must want for your subjects what you want for your own children.

Now I shall speak of justice, the very important and noble function that is to give to each person his due so that no one is punished without good reason. Even when there is a good reason for punishment you should incline to mercy, following the example of Our Heavenly Judge and Eternal King. For no one of us is immune from sin and all of us are weak by our very nature, so there is no one of us who does not need mercy.

Indeed, I do not deny, nor am I ignorant of, the fact that the lord of a city ought to take every precaution to avoid useless and superfluous expenditures. In this way he will not exhaust the treasury and have nothing left for necessary expenditures. Therefore, a lord should spend nothing and do nothing whatsoever that does not further the beauty and good order of the city over which he rules. To put it briefly, he ought to act as a careful guardian of the state, not as its lord. Such was the advice that the Philosopher gave at great length in his Politics, advice that is found to be very useful and clearly consistent with justice. Rulers who act otherwise are to be judged as thieves rather than as defenders and preservers of the state.

From these concerns, however, derives not just the happiness of the people, but the security of the ruling class as well. For no one is more terrifying than a starving commoner of whom it has been said: “the hungry pleb knows no fear.” Indeed, there are not just ancient examples but contemporary ones, especially from recent events in the city of Rome, which bear out this saying.  

---

3 Aristotle Politics 5.9, 1314b40ff, which Petrarch knew only in medieval Latin translation.
4 An allusion to a revolt—caused by famine—by the lower classes of Rome against the senatorial families in 1353, just before the return to the city of the demagogic Cola di Rienzo. See F. Gregorovius, History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages, trans. A. Hamilton, 8 vols. (London, 1898), 6:337ff.
Among those honored for their abilities in governing, the first place ought to go to learned men. And among these learned men, a major place should go to those whose knowledge in law is always very useful to the state. If, indeed, love of and devotion to justice is added to their knowledge of law, these citizens are (as Cicero puts it) “learned not just in the law, but in justice.” However, there are those who follow the law but do no justice, and these are unworthy to bear the name of the legal profession. For it is not enough simply to have knowledge; you must want to use it. A good lawyer adds good intentions to his legal knowledge. Indeed, there have been many lawyers who have added luster to ancient Rome and other places: Adrianus Julius Celsus, Salvius Julianus, Neratius Priscus, Antonius Scaevola, Severus Papinianus, Alexander Domitius Ulpianus, Fabius Sabinus, Julius Paulus, and many others. And you too (as much as our own times permit) have by the patronage of your university added honor to your country. There are other kinds of learned men, some of whom you can depend on for advice and learned conversation, and (as Alexander used to say) invent literary tales. One reads that Julius Caesar, in like fashion, used to confer Roman citizenship on doctors of medicine and on teachers of the liberal arts. Now, among learned men there is no doubt that we ought to give preference to those who teach the knowledge of sacred things (or what we call theology), provided that these men have kept themselves free from any foolish sophistries.

That very wise emperor Augustus used to bestow patronage on learned men to encourage them to remain in Rome, and hope of such a reward stimulated others to study, for at that time Roman citizenship was a highly valued honor. Indeed, when St. Paul claimed that he was a Roman citizen, the tribune judging the case said to him: “I myself have at a high price obtained this status.”

Even if it were not written in any book, still death is certain, as our common nature tells us. Now I do not know whether it is because of human nature or from some longstanding custom that at the death of our close friends and relatives we can scarcely contain our grief and tears, and that our funeral services are often attended by wailings and lamentations. But I do know that scarcely ever has this propensity for public grief been so deep-rooted in other cities as it is in yours. Someone dies—and I do not care whether he is a noble or a commoner, the grief displayed by the commoners is certainly no less manifest, and perhaps more so, than that of the nobles, for the plebs are more apt to show their emotions and less likely to be moved by what is proper; as soon as he breathe his last, a great howling and torrent of tears begins. Now I am not asking you to forbid expressions of grief. This would be difficult and probably impossible, given human nature. But what Jeremiah says is true: “You should not bemoan the dead, nor bathe the corpse in tears.” As the great poet Euripides wrote in Crespontes: “Considering the evil of our present existence, we ought to lament at our birth and rejoice at our death.” But these philosophic opinions are not well known, and, in any case, the common people would find them unthinkable and strange.

Therefore, I will tell you what I am asking. Take an example: Some old dowager dies, and they carry her body into the streets and through the public squares accompanied by loud and indecent wailing so that someone who did not know what was happening could easily think that here was a madman on the loose or that the city was under enemy attack. Now, when the funeral cortege finally gets to the church, the horrible keening redoubles, and at the very spot where there ought to be hymns to Christ or devoted prayers for the soul of the deceased in a subdued voice or even silence, the walls resound with the lamentations of the mourners and the holy altars shake with the wailing of women. All this simply because a human being has died. This custom is contrary to any decent and honorable behavior and unworthy of any city under your rule. I wish you would have it changed. In fact, I am not just advising you, I am (if I may) begging you to do so. Order that wailing women should not be permitted to step outside their homes; and if some lamentation is necessary to the grieved, let them do it at home and do not let them disturb the public thoroughfares.

---

5 Cicero Orationes Philippiacas 9.5.10.
6 Petrarch derived this list of famous legal experts from the time of the Roman Empire mainly from his reading of the Scriptores historiae Augusta passim.
7 Scriptores historiae Augusta 18.34.6.
8 Seutonius Divus Julius 42.
10 Jeremiah 22:10.
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I have said to you perhaps more than I should, but less than I would like to say. And if it seems to you, illustrious sir, that I am mistaken in one place or another, I beg your pardon, and I ask you to consider only the good advice. May you rule your city long and happily. Farewell. Arquà, the 28th of November.

Questions:
1. What examples and sources are used to support various claims by this author?
2. What relation does this author have to the ancient authors of Rome and Greece?
3. What attitudes and aptitudes seem to describe the Renaissance man? How is Petrarch a Renaissance man?
4. What attitudes are expressed about the world and people about them?
5. What is the role of the patron in Renaissance society? How does this affect things?
10.2 Machiavelli: from The Discourses

Niccolo Machiavelli’s (1469–1527) political philosophy was shaped by humanism and practical experience. As a Florentine official and diplomat, Machiavelli had an opportunity to experience first hand the cut-throat world of fifteenth-century Italian politics. In the excerpt from his Discourses included here, Machiavelli used a discussion of Roman history as a vehicle for establishing general political principles.


To some it will appear strange that I have got so far in my discussion of Roman history without having made any mention of the founders of that republic or of either its religious or its military institutions. Hence, that I may not keep the minds of those who are anxious to hear about such things any longer in suspense, let me say that many perchance will think it a bad precedent that the founder of a civic state, such as Romulus, should first have killed his brother, and then have acquiesced in the death of Titus Tatius, the Sabine, whom he had chosen as his colleague in the kingdom. They will urge that, if such actions be justifiable, ambitious citizens who are eager to govern, will follow the example of their prince and use violence against those who are opposed to their authority. A view that will hold good provided we leave out of consideration the end which Romulus had in committing these murders.

One should take it as a general rule that rarely, if ever, does it happen that a state, whether it be a republic or a kingdom, is either well-ordered at the outset or radically transformed vis-à-vis its old institutions unless this be done by one person. It is likewise essential that there should be but one person upon whose mind and method depends any similar process of organization. Therefore the prudent organizer of a state whose intention it is to govern not in his own interests but for the common good, and not in the interest of his successors but for the sake of that fatherland which is common to all, should contrive to be alone in his authority. Nor will any reasonable man blame him for taking any action, however extraordinary, which may be of service in the organizing of a kingdom or the constituting of a republic. It is a sound maxim that reprehensible actions may be justified by their effects, and that when the effect is good, as it was in the case of Romulus, it always justifies the action. For it is the man who uses violence to spoil things, not the man who uses it to mend them, that is blameworthy.

The organizer of a state ought further to have sufficient prudence and virtue not to bequeath the authority he has assumed to any other person, for, seeing that men are more prone to evil than to good, his successor might well make amitious use of that which he had used virtuously. Furthermore, though but one person suffices for the purpose of organization, what he has organized will not last long if it continues to rest on the shoulders of one man, but may well last if many remain in charge and many look to its maintenance. Because, though the many are incompetent to draw up a constitution since diversity of opinion will prevent them from discovering how best to do it, yet when they realize it has been done, they will not agree to abandon it.

That Romulus was a man of this character, that for the death of his brother and of his colleague he deserves to be excused, and that what he did was done for the common good and not to satisfy his personal ambition, is shown by his having at once instituted a senate with which he consulted and with whose views his decisions were in accord. Also, a careful consideration of the authority which Romulus reserved to himself will show that all he reserved to himself was the command of the army in time of war and the convoking of the senate. It is clear, too, that when the Tarquins were expelled and Rome became free, none of its ancient institutions were changed, save that in lieu of a permanent king there were appointed each year two consuls. This shows that the original institutions of this city as a whole were more in conformity with a political and self-governing state than with absolutism or tyranny.

I might adduce in support of what I have just said numberless examples, for example Moses, Lycurgus, Solon and other founders of kingdoms and republics who assumed authority that they might formulate laws to the common good; but this I propose to omit since it is well known. I shall adduce but one further example, not so celebrated but worth considering by those who are contemplating the drawing up of good laws. It is this. Agis, King of Sparta, was considering how to confine the activities of the Spartans to the limits originally set for them by the laws of Lycurgus, because it seemed to him that it was owing to their having deviated from them in part that this city had lost a good deal of its ancient virtue, and, in consequence, a good deal of its power and of its empire. He was, however, while his project was still in the initial stage, killed by the Spartan ephors, who took him to be a man who was out to set up a tyranny. But Cleomenes, his successor in that kingdom, having learned from some records and writings of Agis which he had discovered, what was the latter’s true mind and intention, determined to pursue the same plan. He realized, however, that be could not do this for the
good of his country unless he became the sole authority there, and, since it seemed to him impossible owing to man’s ambition to help the many against the will of the few, he took a suitable opportunity and had all the ephors killed and anybody else who might obstruct him. He then renewed in their entirety the laws of Lycurgus. By so doing he gave fresh life to Sparta, and his reputation might thereby have become as great as that of Lycurgus if it had not been for the power of the Macedonians and the weakness of other Greek republics. For, after Sparta had thus been reorganized, it was attacked by the Macedonians, and, since its forces proved to be inferior and it could get no outside help, it was defeated, with the result that Cleomenes’ plans, however just and praiseworthy, were never brought to completion.

All things considered, therefore, I conclude that it is necessary to be the sole authority if one is to organize a state, and that Romulus’ action in regard to the death of Remus and Titus Tatius is excusable, not blameworthy.

**Question:**
1. Does the end always justify the means?
As soon as I arrived in the Indies, in the first island which I found, I took some of the natives by force, in order to learn how in thirty-three days I passed from the Canary Islands to the Indies, with the fleet which the most illustrious King and Queen, our Sovereigns, gave to me. There I found very many islands, filled with innumerable people, and I have taken possession of them all for their Highnesses, done by proclamation and with the royal standard unfurled, and no opposition was offered to me.

To the first island which I found I gave the name “San Salvador,” in remembrance of the Divine Majesty, Who had marvellously bestowed all this; the Indians call it “Guanahani.” To the second, I gave the name the island of “Santa Maria de Concepcion,” to the third, “Fernandina,” to the fourth, “Isabella,” to the fifth island, “Juana,” and so each received from me a new name. . . .

Española is a marvel. The sierras and the mountains, the plains, the champaigns, are so lovely and so rich for planting and sowing, for breeding cattle of every kind, for building towns and villages. The harbours of the sea here are such as cannot be believed to exist unless they have been seen, and so with the rivers, many and great, and of good water, the majority of which contain gold. In the trees, fruits and plants, there is a great difference from those of Juana. In this island, there are many spices and great mines of gold and of other metals.

The people of this island and of all the other islands which I have found and of which I have information, all go naked, men and women, as their mothers bore them, although some of the women cover a single place with the leaf of a plant or with a net of cotton which they make for the purpose. They have no iron or steel or weapons, nor are they fitted to use them. This is not because they are not well built and of handsome stature, but because they are very marvellously timorous. They have no other arms than spears made of canes, cut in seeding time, to the ends of which they fix a small sharpened stick. Of these they do not dare to make use, for many times it has happened that I have sent ashore two or three men to some town to have speech with them, and countless people have come out to them, and as soon as they have seen my men approaching, they have fled, a father not even waiting for his son. This is not because ill has been done to any one of them; on the contrary, at every place where I have been and have been able to have speech with them, I have given to them of that which I had, such as cloth and many other things, receiving nothing in exchange. But so they are, incurably timid. It is true that, after they have been reassured and have lost this fear, they are so guileless and so generous with all that they possess, that no one would believe it who has not seen it. They refuse nothing that they possess, if it be asked of them; on the contrary, they invite any one to share it and display as much love as if they would give their hearts. They are content with whatever trifle of whatever kind that may be given to them, whether it be of value or valueless. I forbade that they should be given things so worthless as fragments of broken crockery, scraps of broken glass and lace tips, although when they were able to get them, they fancied that they possessed the best jewel in the world. So it was found that for a thong a sailor received gold to the weight of two and a half Castellanos, and others received much more for other things which were worth less. As for new blancas, for them they would give everything which they had, although it might be two or three castellanos’ [gold coins] weight of gold or an arroba or two of spun cotton. They took even the pieces of the broken hoops of the wine barrels and, like savages, gave what they had, so that it seemed to me to be wrong and I forbade it. I gave them a thousand handsome good things, which I had brought, in order that they might conceive affection for us and, more than that, might become Christians and be inclined to the love and service of Your Highnesses and of the whole Castilian nation, and strive to collect and give us of the things which they have in abundance and which are necessary to us.

They do not hold any creed nor are they idolaters; but they all believe that power and good are in the heavens and were very firmly convinced that I, with these ships and men, came from the heavens, and in this belief they everywhere received me after they had mastered their fear. This belief is not the result of ignorance, for they are, on the contrary, of a very acute intelligence and they are men who navigate all those seas, so that it is amazing how good an account they give of everything. It is because they have never seen people clothed or ships of such a kind.

As soon as I arrived in the Indies, in the first island which I found, I took some of the natives by force, in order that they might learn and might give me information of whatever there is in these parts. And so it was that they soon understood us, and we them, either by speech or signs, and they have been very serviceable. At present, those I bring with me...
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are still of the opinion that I come from Heaven, for all the intercourse which they have had with me. They were the first to announce this wherever I went, and the others went running from house to house, and to the neighbouring towns, with loud cries of, “Come! Come! See the men from Heaven!” So all came, men and women alike, when their minds were set at rest concerning us, not one, small or great, remaining behind, and they all brought something to eat and drink, which they gave with extraordinary affection. . . .

In all these islands, I saw no great diversity in the appearance of the people or in their manners and language. On the contrary, they all understand one another, which is a very curious thing, on account of which I hope that their Highnesses will determine upon their conversion to our holy faith, towards which they are very inclined.

I have already said how I went one hundred and seven leagues in a straight line from west to east along the seashore of the island of Juana, and as a result of this voyage I can say that this island is larger than England and Scotland together, for, beyond these one hundred and seven leagues, there remain to the westward two provinces to which I have not gone. One of these provinces they call “Avan,” and there people are born with tails. These provinces cannot have a length of less than fifty or sixty leagues, as I could understand from those Indians whom I have and who know all the islands.

The other island, Española, has a circumference greater than all Spain from Collioure by the seacoast to Fuenterabia in Vizcaya, for I voyaged along one side for one hundred and eighty-eight great leagues in a straight line from west to east. It is a land to be desired and, when seen, never to be left. I have taken possession of all for their Highnesses, and all are more richly endowed than I know how or am able to say, and I hold all for their Highnesses, so that they may dispose of them as they do of the kingdoms of Castile and as absolutely. But especially, in this Española, in the situation most convenient and in the best position for the mines of gold and for all trade as well with the mainland here as with that there, belonging to the Grand Khan, where will be great trade and profit, I have taken possession of a large town, to which I gave the name “Villa de Navidad,” and in it I have made fortifications and a fort, which will now by this time be entirely completed. In it I have left enough men for such a purpose with arms and artillery and provisions for more than a year, and a fusta, and one, a master of all seacraft, to build others, and I have established great friendship with the king of that land, so much so, that he was proud to call me “brother” and to treat me as such. . . .

In conclusion, to speak only of what has been accomplished on this voyage, which was so hasty, their Highnesses can see that I will give them as much gold as they may need, if their Highnesses will render me very slight assistance; presently, I will give them spices and cotton, as much as their Highnesses shall command; and mastic, as much as they shall order to be shipped and which, up to now, has been found only in Greece, in the island of Chios, and the Seignory sells it for what it pleases; and aloe, as much as they shall order to be shipped; and slaves, as many as they shall order, and who will be from the idolaters. I believe also that I have found rhubarb and cinnamon, and I shall find a thousand other things of value, which the people whom I have left there will have discovered, for I have not delayed at any point, so far as the wind allowed me to sail, except in the town of Navidad, in order to leave it secured and well established, and in truth I should have done much more if the ships had served me as reason demanded. . . .

This is an account of the facts, thus abridged.

Done in the caravel, off the Canary Islands, on the fifteenth day of February, in the year one thousand four hundred and ninety-three.

Question:
1. How could Columbus reconcile his views of the native peoples with his stated intention of taking their gold and enslaving them?
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10.4 Bartholomew De Las Casas: Amerindians and the “Garden of Eden”

When Bartholomé De Las Casas (1474–1566) was twenty-eight years old, he made his first trip to the Americas. By 1514, he had committed himself to pressuring the Spanish government to improve the treatment of the Amerindians, to abolish slavery and forced labor, and to devote more resources to the spread of Catholicism in the New World. He would spend his entire life working towards these goals.


God has created all these numberless people to be quite the simplest, without malice or duplicity, most obedient, most faithful to their natural Lords, and to the Christians, whom they serve; the most humble, most patient, most peaceful, and calm, without strife nor tumults; not wrangling, nor querulous, as free from uproar, hate and desire of revenge, as any in the world.

They are likewise the most delicate people, weak and of feeble constitution, and less than any other can they bear fatigue, and they very easily die of whatsoever infirmity; so much so, that not even the sons of our Princes and of nobles, brought up in royal and gentle life, are more delicate than they; although there are among them such as are of the peasant class. They are also a very poor people, who of worldly goods possess little, nor wish to possess: and they are therefore neither proud, nor ambitious, nor avaricious. . . .

They are likewise of a clean, unspoiled, and vivacious intellect, very capable, and receptive to every good doctrine; most prompt to accept our Holy Catholic Faith, to be endowed with virtuous customs; and they have as little difficulty with such things as any people created by God in the world.

Once they have begun to learn of matters pertaining to faith, they are so importunate to know them, and in frequenting the sacraments and divine service of the Church, that to tell the truth, the clergy have need to be endowed of God with the gift of preeminent patience to bear with them: and finally, I have heard many lay Spaniards frequently say many years ago, (unable to deny the goodness of those they saw) certainly these people were the most blessed of the earth, had they only knowledge of God.

THE “SINS” OF THE SPANISH INVASION

Militant friars like Las Casas and many of his fellow Dominicans also tried to picture the Spanish conquistadors and settlers as vicious and cruel exploiters. These tales had some basis in reality, but they were also aimed at convincing a European audience that the excesses of the conquest had to be curbed and the powers of the crown and the clergy expanded in the New World. Along with the images of the indigenous peoples as innocents reminiscent of the Garden of Eden, they created a powerful picture of European excesses. According to many friars, these abuses undermined the chances for salvation of all Christians who tolerated such “sins” against humanity. The selection below is taken from Bartolomé de las Casas, Very Brief Account of the Destruction of the Indies, trans. Francis Augusts MacNutt in Bartholomew De Las Casas, 319–20.

The Christians, with their horses and swords and lances, began to slaughter and practise strange cruelty among them. They penetrated into the country and spared neither children nor the aged, nor pregnant women, nor those in child labour, all of whom they ran through the body and lacerated, as though they were assaulting so many lambs herded in their sheepfold.

They made bets as to who would slit a man in two, or cut off his head at one blow; or they opened up his bowels. They tore the babes from their mothers’ breast by the feet, and dashed their heads against the rocks. Others they seized by the shoulders and threw into the rivers, laughing and joking, and when they fell into the water they exclaimed: “boil body of so and so!” They spitted the bodies of other babes, together with their mothers and all who were before them, on their swords.

They made a gallows just high enough for the feet to nearly touch the ground, and by thirteens, in honour and reverence of our Redeemer and the twelve Apostles, they put wood underneath and, with fire, they burned the Indians alive. . . .

And because all the people who could flee, hid among the mountains and climbed the crags to escape from men so deprived of humanity, so wicked, such wild beasts, exterminators and capital enemies of all the human race, the Spaniards taught and trained the fiercest boar-hounds to tear an Indian to pieces as soon as they saw him, so that they more willingly attacked and ate one, than if he had been a boar. These hounds made great havoc and slaughter.

Question:
1. What are the similarities between Columbus’s view of the natives and that of Las Casas? What explains the dramatic difference in how they sought to treat the natives?
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10.5 Cellini: The Artist

Cellini (1500–1571) was an artist who made his living as a goldsmith in the Italian city-states of Florence and Rome. He was also quite a talented musician. The following excerpt, from his autobiography, written between 1558–1562, describes his life and work as an artist. It was not published until the eighteenth century, when it became quite popular.


II

It is true that men who have laboured with some show of excellence, have already given knowledge of themselves to the world; and this alone ought to suffice them; I mean the fact that they have proved their manhood and achieved renown. Yet one must needs live like others; and so in a work like this there will always be found occasion for natural bragging, which is of divers kinds, and the first is that a man should let others know he draws his lineage from persons of worth and most ancient origin.

When I reached the age of fifteen, I put myself, against my father’s will, to the goldsmith’s trade with a man called Antonio, son of Sandro, known commonly as Marcone the goldsmith. He was a most excellent craftsman and a very good fellow to boot, high-spirited and frank in all his ways. My father would not let him give me wages like the other apprentices; for having taken up the study of this art to please myself, he wished me to indulge by whim for drawing to the full. I did so willingly enough; and that honest master of mine took marvellous delight in my performances. He had an only son, a bastard, to whom he often gave his orders, in order to spare me. My liking for the art was so great, or, I may truly say, my natural bias, both one and the other, that in a few months I caught up the good, nay, the best young craftsmen in our business, and began to reap the fruits of my labours. I did not, however, neglect to gratify my good father from time to time by playing on the flute or cornet. Each time he heard me, I used to make his tears fall accompanied with deep-drawn sighs of satisfaction. My filial piety often made me give him that contentment, and induced me to pretend that I enjoyed the music too.

XIV

[... Later, after traveling to Rome, he entered a new workshop]

“Welcome to my workshop; and do as you have promised; let your hands declare what man you are.”

He gave me a very fine piece of silver plate to work on for a cardinal. It was a little oblong box, copied from the prophyry sarcophagus before the door of the Rotonda. Beside what I copied, I enriched it with so many elegant masks of my invention, that my master went about showing it through the art, and boast ing that so good a piece of work had been turned out from his shop. It was about half a cubit in size, and was so constructed as to serve for a salt-cellar at table. This was the first earning that I touched at Rome, and part of it I sent to assist my good father; the rest I kept for my own use, living upon it while I went about studying the antiquities of Rome, until my money failed, and I had to return to the shop for work.

... After undertaking some new commissions, I took it into my head, as soon as I had finished them, to change my master; I had indeed been worried into doing so by a certain Milanese, called Pagolo Arsago. My first master, Firenzuola, had a great quarrel about this with Arsago, and abused him in my presence; whereupon I took up speech in defence of my new master. I said that I was born free, and free I meant to live, and that there was no reason to complain of him, far less of me, since some few crowns of wages were still due to me; also that I chose to go, like a free journeyman, where it pleased me, knowing I did wrong to no man. My new master then put in with his excuses, saying that he had not asked me to come, and that I should gratify him by returning to Firenzuola. To this I replied that I was not aware of wronging the latter in any way, and as I had completed his commissions, I chose to be my own master and not the man of others, and that he who wanted me must beg me of myself. Firenzuola cried: “I don’t intend to beg you of yourself; I have done with you; don’t show yourself again upon my premises.” I reminded him of the money he owed me. He laughed me in the face; on which I said that if I knew how to use my tools in handicraft as well as he had seen, I could be quite as clever with my sword in claiming the just payment of my labour. While we were exchanging these words, an old man happened to come up, called Maestro Antonio, of San Marino. He was the chief among the Roman goldsmiths, and had been Firenzuola’s master. Hearing what
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I had to say, which I took good care that he should understand, he immediately espoused my cause, and bade Firenzuola pay me. The dispute waxed warm, because Firenzuola was an admirable swordsman, far better than he was a goldsmith. Yet reason made itself heard; and I backed my cause with the same spirit, till I got myself paid. In course of time Firenzuola and I became friends, and at his request I stood godfather to one of his children.

XV

I went on working with Pagolo Arsago, and earned a good deal of money, the greater part of which I always sent to my good father. At the end of two years, upon my father’s entreaty, I returned to Florence, and put myself once more under Francesco Salimbene, with whom I earned a great deal, and took continual pains to improve in my arts. I renewed my intimacy with Francesco di Filippo; and though I was too much given to pleasure, owing to that accursed music, I never neglected to devote some hours of the day or night to study.

XIX

During that time I went to draw sometimes in Michel Agnolo’s chapel, and sometimes in the house of Agostino Chigi of Siena, which contained many incomparable paintings by the hand of that great master Raffaello. This I did on feast-days, because the house was then inhabited by Messer Gismondo, Agostino’s brother. They plumed themselves exceedingly when they saw young men of my sort coming to study in their palaces. Gismondo’s wife, noticing my frequent presence in that house—she was a lady as courteous as could be, and of surpassing beauty—came up to me one day, looked at my drawings, and asked me if I was a sculptor or a painter; to whom I said I was a goldsmith. She remarked that I drew too well for a goldsmith; and having made one of her waiting-maids bring a lily of the finest diamonds set in gold, she showed it to me, and bade me value it. I valued it at 800 crowns. Then she said that I had very nearly hit the mark, and asked me whether I felt capable of setting the stones really well. I said that I should much like to do so, and began before her eyes to make a little sketch for it, working all the better because of the pleasure I took in conversing with so lovely and agreeable a gentlewoman. When the sketch was finished, another Roman lady of great beauty joined us; she had been above, and now descending to the ground-floor, asked Madonna Porzia what she was doing there. She answered with a smile: “I am amusing myself by watching this worthy young man at his drawing; he is as good as he is handsome.” I had by this time acquired a trifle of assurance, mixed, however, with some honest bashfulness; so I blushed and said: “Such as I am, lady, I shall ever be most ready to serve you.” The gentlewoman, also slightly blushing, said: “You know well that I want you to serve me”; and reaching me the lily, told me to take it away; and gave me besides twenty golden crowns which she had in her bag, and added: “Set me the jewel after the fashion you have sketched, and keep for me the old gold in which it is now set.” On this the Roman lady observed: “If I were in that young man’s body, I should go off without asking leave.” Madonna Porzia replied that virtues rarely are at home with vices, and that if I did such a thing, I should strongly belie my good looks of an honest man. Then turning round, she took the Roman lady’s hand, and with a pleasant smile said: “Farewell, Benvenuto.” I stayed on a short while at the drawing I was making, which was a copy of a Jove by Raffaello. When I had finished it and left the house, I set myself to making a little model of wax, in order to show how the jewel would look when it was completed. This I took to Madonna Porzia, whom I found with the same Roman lady. Both of them were highly satisfied with my work, and treated me so kindly that, being somewhat emboldened, I promised the jewel should be twice as good as the model. Accordingly I set hand to it, and in twelve days I finished it in the form of a fleur-de-lys, as I have said above, ornamenting it with little masks, children, and animals, exquisitely enamelled, whereby the diamonds which formed the lily were more than doubled in effect.

XX

While I was working at this piece, Lucagnolo, of whose ability I have before spoken, showed considerable discontent, telling me over and over again that I might acquire far more profit and honour by helping him to execute large plate, as I had done at first. I made him answer that, whenever I chose, I should always be capable of working at great silver pieces; but that things like that on which I was now engaged were not commissioned every day; and beside their bringing no less honour than large silver plate, there was also more profit to be made by them. He laughed me in the face, and said: “Wait and see Benvenuto; for by the time that you have finished that work of yours, I will make haste to have finished this vase, which I took in hand when you did the jewel; and then experience shall teach you what profit I shall get from my vase, and what you will get from your ornament.” I answered that I was very glad indeed to enter into such a competition with so good a craftsman as he was, because the end would show which of us was mistaken. Accordingly both the one and
the other of us, with a scornful smile upon our lips, bent our heads in grim earnest to the work, which both were now desirous of accomplishing; so that after about ten days, each had finished his undertaking with the great delicacy and artistic skill.

So he took his vase and carried it to the Pope, who was very well pleased with it, and ordered at once that he should be paid at the ordinary rate of such large plate. Meanwhile I carried mine to Madonna Porzia, who looked at it with astonishment, and told me I had far surpassed my promise. Then she bade me ask for my reward whatever I liked; for it seemed to her my desert was so great that if I craved a castle she could hardly recompense me; but since that was not in her hands to bestow, she added laughing that I must beg what lay within her power. I answered that the greatest reward I could desire for my labour was to have satisfied her ladyship. Then, smiling in my turn, and bowing to her, I took my leave, saying I wanted no reward but that. She turned to the Roman lady and said: “You see that the qualities we discerned in him are accompanied by virtues, and not vices.” They both expressed their admiration, and then Madonna Porzio continued: “Friend Benvenuto, have you never heard it said that when the poor give to the rich, the devil laughs?” I replied: “Quite true! and yet, in the midst of all his troubles, I should like this time to see him laugh”; and as I took my leave, she said that this time she had no will to bestow on him that favour.

When I came back to the shop, Lucagnolo had the money for his vase in a paper packet; and on my arrive he cried out: “Come and compare the price of your jewel with the price of my plate.” I said that he must leave things as they were till the next day, because I hoped that even as my work in its kind was not less excellent than his, so I should be able to show him quite an equal price for it.

On the following, Madonna Porzia sent a major-domo of hers to my shop, who called me out, and putting into my hands a paper packet full of money from his lady, told me that she did not choose the devil should have his whole laugh out; by which she hinted that the money sent me was not the entire payment merited by my industry, and other messages were added worthy of so courteous a lady. Lucagnolo, who was burning to compare his packet with mine, burst into the shop, then in the presence of twelve journeymen and some neighbors, eager to behold the result of this competition, he seized his packet, scornfully exclaiming “Ou! Ou!” three or four times, while he poured his money on the counter with a great noise. They were twenty-five crowns in giulios; and he fancied that mine would be four or five crowns di moneta. I for my part, stunned and stifled by his cries, and by the looks and smiles of the bystanders, first peeped into my packet; then, after seeing that it contained nothing but gold, I retired to one end of the counter, and keeping my eyes lowered and making no noise at all, I lifted it with both hands suddenly above my head, and emptied it like a mill hopper. My coin was twice as much as his; which caused the onlookers, who had fixed their eyes on me with some derision, to turn round suddenly to him and say: “Lucagnolo, Benvenuto’s pieces, being all of gold and twice as many as yours, make a far finer effect.” I thought for certain that, what with jealousy and what with shame, Lucagnolo would have fallen dead upon the spot; and though he took the third part of my gain, since I was a journeymen (for such is the custom of the trade, two-thirds fall to the workman and one-third to the masters of the shop), yet inconsiderate envy had more power in him than avarice: it ought indeed to have worked quite the other way; he being a peasant’s son from Iesi. He cursed his art and those who taught it to him, vowing that henceforth he would never work at large plate, but give his whole attention to those whoreson gewgaws, since they were so well paid. Equally engaged on my side, I answered that every bird sang its own note; that he talked after the fashion of the hovels he came from; but that I dared swear that I should succeed with ease in making his lubberly lumber, while he would never be successful in my whoreson gewgaws. Thus I flung off in a passion, telling him that I would soon show him that I spoke truth. The bystanders openly declared against him, holding him for a lout, as indeed he was, and me for a man, as I had proved myself.

While I was pushing forward Salamanca’s vase, I had only one little boy as help, whom I had taken at the entreaty of friends, and half against my own will, to be my workman. He was about fourteen years of age, bore the name of Paulino, and was son to a Roman burgess, who lived upon the income of his property. Paulino was the best-mannered, the most honest, and the most beautiful boy I ever saw in my whole life. His modest ways and actions, together with his superlative beauty and his devotion to myself, bred in me as great an affection for him as a man’s breast can hold. This passionate love led me often-times to delight the lad with music; for I observed that his marvellous features, which by complexion wore a tone of modest melancholy, brightened up, and when I took my cornet, broke into a smile so lovely and sweet, that
I do not marvel at the silly stories which the Greeks have written about the deities of heaven. Indeed, if my boy had lived in those times, he would probably have turned their heads still more. He had a sister, named Faustina, more beautiful, I verily believe, than that Faustina about whom the old books gossip so. Sometimes he took me to their vineyard, and, so far as I could judge, it struck me that Paulino’s good father would have welcomed me as a son-in-law. This affair led me to play more than I was used to do.

It happened at that time that one Giangiacomo of Cesena, a musician in the Pope’s band, and a very excellent performer, sent word through Lorenzo, the trumpeter of Lucca, who is now in our Duke’s service, to inquire whether I was inclined to help them at the Pope’s Ferragosto, playing soprano with my cornet in some motets of great beauty selected by them for that occasion. Although I had the greatest desire to finish the vase I had begun, yet, since music has a wondrous charm of its own, and also because I wished to please my old father, I consented to join them. During eight days before the festival we practised two hours a day together; then on the first of August we went to the Belvedere, and while Pope Clemente was at table, we played those carefully studied motets so well that his Holiness protested he had never heard music more sweetly executed or with better harmony of parts. He sent for Giangiacomo, and asked him where and how he had procured so excellent a cornet for soprano, and inquired particularly who I was. Giangiacomo told him my name in full. Whereupon the Pope said: “So, then, he is the son of Maestro Giovanni?” On being assured I was, the Pope expressed his wish to have me in his service with the other bandsmen. Giangiacomo replied: “Most blessed Father, I cannot pretend for certain that you will get him, for his profession, to which he devotes himself assiduously, is that of a goldsmith, and he works in it miraculously well, and earns by it far more than he could do by playing.” To this the Pope added: “I am the better inclined to him now that I find him possessor of a talent more than I expected. See that he obtains the same salary as the rest of you; and tell him from me to join my service, and that I will find work enough by the day for him to do at his other trade.” Then stretching out his hand, he gave him a hundred golden crowns of the Camera in a handkerchief, and said: “Divide these so that he may take his share.”

Questions:
1. What examples and sources are used to support various claims by this author?
2. What relation does this author have to the ancient authors of Rome and Greece?
3. What attitudes and aptitudes seem to describe the Renaissance man? How is Cellini a Renaissance man?
Marriage relations in Medieval and Renaissance Europe were not just about love—or rather they were not at all about love. Particularly among the elites of long-standing, blood and family ties were valued more than almost anything else. In the following excerpt, we see some of the honor, prestige, and property that were at stake in marriage negotiations in fourteenth-century Italy.


MARRIAGE NEGOTIATIONS: THE STROZZI, 1464–65

[April 20, 1464]... Concerning the matter of a wife [for Filippo], it appears to me that if Francesco di Messer Guglielmino Tanagli wishes to give his daughter, that it would be a fine marriage.... Now I will speak with Marco [Parenti, Alessandra’s son-in-law], to see if there are other prospects that would be better, and if there are none, then we will learn if he wishes to give her [in marriage].... Francesco Tanagli has a good reputation, and he has held office, not the highest, but still he has been in office. You may ask: “Why should he give her to someone in exile?” There are three reasons. First, there aren’t many young men of good family who have both virtue and property. Secondly, she has only a small dowry, 1,000 florins, which is the dowry of an artisan.... Third, I believe that he will give her away, because he has a large family and he will need help to settle them....

[July 26, 1465]... Marco Parenti came to me and told me that for some time, he has been considering how to find a wife for you.... There is the daughter of Francesco di Messer Guglielmino Tanagli, and until now there hasn’t been anyone who is better suited for you than this girl. It is true that we haven’t discussed this at length, for a reason which you understand. However, we have made secret inquiries, and the only people who are willing to make a marriage agreement with exiles have some flaw, either a lack of money or something else. Now money is the least serious drawback, if the other factors are positive.... Francesco is a good friend of Marco and he trusts him. On S. Jacopo’s day, he spoke to him discreetly and persuasively, saying that for several months he had heard that we were interested in the girl and... that when we had made up our minds, she will come to us willingly. [He said that] you were a worthy man, and that his family had always made good marriages, but that he had only a small dowry to give her, and so he would prefer to send her outside of Florence to someone of worth, rather than to give her to someone here, from among those who were available, with little money.... He invited Marco to his house and he called the girl down.... Marco said that she was attractive and that she appeared to be suitable. We have information that she is affable and competent. She is responsible for a large family (there are twelve children, six boys and six girls), and the mother is always pregnant and isn’t very competent....

[August 17, 1465]... Sunday morning I went to the first mass at S. Reparata... to see the Adimari girl, who customarily goes to that mass, and I found the Tanagli girl there. Not knowing who she was, I stood beside her.... She is very attractive, well proportioned, as large or larger than Caterina [Alessandra’s daughter].... She has a long face, and her features are not very delicate, but they aren’t like a peasant’s. From her demeanor, she does not appear to me to be indolent.... I walked behind her as we left the church, and thus I realized that she was one of the Tanagli. So I am somewhat enlightened about her....

[August 31, 1465]... I have recently received some very favorable information [about the Tanagli girl] from two individuals.... They are in agreement that whoever gets her will be content.... Concerning her beauty, they told me what I had already seen, that she is attractive and well-proportioned. Her face is long, but I couldn’t look directly into her face, since she appeared to be aware that I was examining her... and so she turned away from me like the wind.... She reads quite well... and she can dance and sing.... Her father is one of the most respected young men of Florence, very civilized in his manners. He is fond of this girl, and it appears that he has brought her up well.

So yesterday I sent for Marco and told him what I had learned. And we talked about the matter for a while, and decided that he should say something to the father and give him a little hope, but not so much that we couldn’t withdraw, and find out from him the amount of the dowry.... Marco and Francesco [Tanagli] had a discussion, about this yesterday (I haven’t seen him since), and Marco should inform you about it one of these days, and you will then understand more clearly what should follow. May God help us to choose what will contribute to our tranquillity and to the consolation of us all....
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[September 13, 1465]... Marco came to me and said that he had met with Francesco Tanagli, who had spoken very coldly, so that I understand that he had changed his mind. They say that he wants to discuss the matter with his brother-in-law, Messer Antonio Ridolfi.... And he [Francesco] says that it would be a serious matter to send his daughter so far away [to Naples], and to a house that might be described as a hotel. And he spoke in such a way that it is clear that he has changed his mind. I believe that this is the result of the long delay in our replying to him, both yours and Marco’s. Two weeks ago, he could have given him a little hope. Now this delay has angered him, and he has at hand some prospect that is more attractive.... I am very annoyed by this business; I can’t recall when I have been so troubled. For I felt that this marriage would have satisfied our needs better than any other we could have found....

[Filippo Strozzi eventually married Fiametta di Donato Adimari, in 1466.]

Questions:
These questions refer to this document and the following document 10.7 On Wifely Duties.
1. What comparisons can be made between the lives and responsibilities of men and women based on these Renaissance documents?
2. Historian Joan Kelly, in an article published in Becoming Visible: Women in European History in 1977, asked “did women have a Renaissance?” How would you answer this question based on the documents provided? Be sure to define what you mean by Renaissance.
10.7 **On Wifely Duties**

Francesco Barbaro wrote *On Wifely Duties* to his friend and fellow aristocrat, Lorenzo de Medici, on the occasion of the latter’s marriage in 1416. He hoped to teach the youth of Florence through de Medici’s example and the circulation of his treatise under Medici’s auspices. He also wanted to stress the importance of marriage to the maintenance of the aristocratic ruling families of his native Venice in particular and to the Italian city-states more generally.


---

**CHAPTER 1. ON THE FACULTY OF OBEDIENCE**

This is now the remaining part to be done here, in which if wives follow me, either of their own free will or by the commands of their husbands, no one will be so unfair as to think that I have not so established the duties of the wife that youth can enjoy peace and quiet the whole life long. Therefore, there are three things that, if they are diligently observed by a wife, will make a marriage praiseworthy and admirable: love for her husband, modesty of life, and diligent and complete care in domestic matters. We shall discuss the first of these, but before this I want to say something about the faculty of obedience, which is her master and companion, because nothing more important, nothing greater can be demanded of a wife than this.

If a husband, excited to anger, should scold you more than your ears are accustomed to hear, tolerate his wrath silently. But if he has been struck silent by a fit of depression, you should address him with sweet and suitable words, encourage, console, amuse, and humor him. Those who work with elephants do not wear white clothes, and those who work with wild bulls are right not to wear red; for those beasts are made ever more ferocious by those colors. Many authors report that tigers are angered by drums and made violent by them. Wives ought to observe the same thing; if, indeed, a particular dress is offensive to a husband, then we advise them not to wear it, so that they do not give affront to their husbands, with whom they ought to live peacefully and pleasantly.

The wife who is angry with her husband because of jealousy and is considering a separation should ask herself this question: If I put myself in a workhouse because I hate a whore, what could make her far happier and more fortunate than this? She would see me almost shipwrecked, while at the same time she was sailing with favorable winds and securely casting her anchor into my marriage bed?

It was considered very good for domestic peace and harmony if a wife kept her husband’s love with total diligence. At the Olympic games that were dedicated to the great god Jupiter and attended by all of Greece, Gorgias used his eloquence to urge a union of all the Greeks. Melanthus said: Our patron attempts to persuade us that we should all join together in a league, but he cannot bring himself and his wife and her maid—who are only three people—to a mutual agreement (for the wife was very jealous because Gorgias was wildly enamoured of her maid). Likewise, Philip was for a long time displeased with the queen Olympias and Alexander. And when Demaratus of Corinth returned from Greece, Philip eagerly and closely questioned him about the union of the Greeks. Demaratus said to him: “Philip, I consider it a very bad thing that you are spending all your energy in bringing peace and concord to all of Greece when you are not yet reconciled with your own wife and son.” Therefore, if any woman wants to govern her children and servants, she should make sure that she is, first of all, at peace with her husband. Otherwise, it will seem that she wants to imitate the very things that she is trying to correct in them. In order that a wife does her duty and brings peace and harmony to her household, she must agree to the first principle that she does not disagree with her husband on any point. But of this enough has been said.
CHAPTER 2. ON LOVE

In the first place, let wives strive so that their husbands will clearly perceive that they are pensive or joyful according to the differing states of their husbands’ fortunes. Surely congratulations are proper in times of good fortune, just as consolations are appropriate in times of adversity. Let them openly discuss whatever is bothering them, provided it is worthy of prudent people, and let them feign nothing, dissemble nothing, and conceal nothing. Very often sorrow and trouble of mind are relieved by means of discussion and counsel that ought to be carried out in a friendly fashion with the husband. If a husband shares all the pressures of her anxieties he will lighten them by participating in them and make their burden lighter; but if her troubles are very great or deeply rooted, they will be relieved as long as she is able to sigh in the embrace of her husband. I would like wives to live with their husbands in such a way that they can always be in agreement, and if this can be done, then, as Pythagoras defines friendship, the two are united in one.

I therefore would like wives to evidence modesty at all times and in all places. They can do this if they will preserve an evenness and restraint in the movements of the eyes, in their walking, and in the movement of their bodies; for the wandering of the eyes, a hasty gait, and excessive movement of the hands and other parts of the body cannot be done without loss of dignity, and such actions are always joined to vanity and are signs of frivolity.

Moreover, I earnestly beg that wives observe the precept of avoiding immoderate laughter. This is a habit that is indecent in all persons, but it is especially hateful in a woman. On the other hand, women should not be censured if they laugh a little at a good joke and thus lapse somewhat from their serious demeanor. Demosthenes used to rehearse his legal speeches at home in front of a mirror so that with his own eyes he could judge what he should do and what he should avoid in delivering his speeches at court. We may well apply this practice to wifely behavior.

I wish that wives would daily think and consider what the dignity, the status of being a wife requires, so that they will not be lacking in dignified comportment.

We who follow a middle way should establish some rather liberal rules for our wives. They should not be shut up in their bedrooms as in a prison but should be permitted to go out, and this privilege should be taken as evidence of their virtue and propriety. Still, wives should not act with their husbands as the moon does with the sun; for when the moon is near the sun it is never visible, but when it is distant it stands resplendent by itself. Therefore, I would have wives be seen in public with their husbands, but when their husbands are away wives should stay at home. By maintaining an honest gaze in their eyes, they can communicate most significantly as in painting, which is called silent poetry. They also should maintain dignity in the motion of their heads and the other movements of their bodies. Now that I have spoken about demeanor and behavior, I shall now speak of speech.

CHAPTER 4. ON SPEECH AND SILENCE

Isocrates warns men to speak on those matters that they know well and about which they cannot, on account of their dignity, remain silent. We commend women to concede the former as the property of men, but they should consider the latter to be appropriate to themselves as well as to men. Loquacity cannot be sufficiently reproached in women, as many very learned and wise men have stated, nor can silence be sufficiently applauded. For this reason women were prohibited by the laws of the Romans from pleading either criminal or civil law cases.

CHAPTER 8. ON DOMESTIC MATTERS AND THE MANAGEMENT OF HOUSEHOLDS AND SERVANTS

We are interested in the care of our property and the diligence proper to our servants and staff because it is necessary to have both property and servants, without whose help family life itself cannot exist. Surely it is in these two things that the management of domestic matters primarily is involved, for unless a wife imposes her own judgment and precepts on these matters, the operation of the household will have no order and will be in great disorder. Men are naturally endowed with strength of mind and body; both for these and other reasons, they provision their homes by their labor, industry, and willingness to undergo hardships. Conversely, I think we may infer that since women are by nature weak they should diligently care for things concerning the household. For weakness can never be separated from cares nor cares from vigilance. What is the use of bringing home great wealth unless the wife will work at preserving, maintaining, and utilizing it?
They ought to attend, therefore, to governing their households just as Pericles daily attended to the affairs of Athens. And they ought always to consider how well they are doing so that they will never be deficient in their care, interest, and diligence in household matters. They will surely be successful in this matter if they do what they should do, that is, if they are accustomed to stay at home and oversee everything there.

So that a wife’s duty might be commended to posterity, there were affixed to the bronze statue of Gaia Caecilia, the daughter of Tarquinius, an ordinary shoe and a distaff and spindle, so that those objects might in some way signify that her diligent work at home ought to be imitated by future generations. What neglectful landowner can hope to have hard-working peasants? What slothful general can make his soldiers vigilant for the state? Therefore, if a wife would like to have her maids working hard at home, she should not merely instruct them with words but she ought also by her actions to demonstrate, indicate, and show what they should be doing. Indeed, there is surely nothing more excellent in household affairs than that everything be put in its place, because there is nothing more beautiful, more useful than order, which is always of the greatest importance. We consider that an army or chorus can be called anything but an army or chorus unless its organization is well preserved. I would have wives imitate the leaders of bees, who supervise, receive, and preserve whatever comes into their hives, to the end that, unless necessity dictates otherwise, they remain in their honeycombs where they develop and mature beautifully. Wives may send their maids and manservants abroad if they think this would be useful to them. But if, indeed, these servants are required at home, they should urge, order, and require their presence. Wives should also consider it their duties to see to it that no harm comes to their husbands’ winecellars, pantries, and oil cellars.

It is now proper to speak, as we have promised, about servants, who, provided they are not neglected, can add great luster to our houses and be useful and pleasant. So they will be if wives will instruct them carefully and if they will not get angry with them before, having warned them, they discover that they have made the same mistakes. I should like that wives, in these matters as in others, follow the example of the leaders of the bees, who allow no one under their control to be lazy or negligent.

Thrifty wives constantly ought to seek out and appoint sober stewards for the provisions and address them courteously and be generous of them, so that by the great interest of the mistress the industry of the steward daily increases. They should feed their servants so that they will satisfy both their human needs and reward their constant labor. Wives should clothe their servants comfortably as befits the season, climate, and place. Moreover, as Hesiod advises, they should always be careful that servants are not separated from their children and families, for servants will always find a way to stay together with their own family, even secretly. Furthermore, servants will be very grateful if especially good medical care is provided when a member of their family is taken sick. For these acts of humanity, this solicitousness will make servants very conscientious and hardworking for the household.

After their offspring have passed their infancy, mothers should use all their skill, care, and effort to ensure that their children are endowed with excellent qualities of mind and body. First they should instruct them in their duty toward Immortal God, their country, and their parents, so that they will be instilled from their earliest years with those qualities that are the foundation of all other virtues. Only those children who fear God, obey the laws, honor their parents, respect their superiors, are pleasant with their equals and courteous to their inferiors, will exhibit much hope for themselves. Children should meet all people with a civil demeanor, pleasant countenance, and friendly words. But they should be on the most familiar terms with only the best people. Thus they will learn moderation in food and drink so that they may lay, as it were, the foundation of temperance for their future lives. They should be taught to avoid these pleasures that are dishonorable, and they should apply their efforts and thoughts to those matters that are the most becoming and will be useful and pleasant.

---

79 Cf. Xenophon Oeconomicus 7.3.5.
81 Cf. Plutarch Quaestiones Romanae 30; Moralia 271E.
82 Cf. Xenophon Oeconomicus 1.3.
88 Cf. Xenophon Oeconomicus 7.33.
90 Probably an allusion to Hesiod Opera et Dies 373.
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when they become older. If mothers are able to instruct their children in these matters, their offspring will much more easily and better receive the benefit of education.

Mothers should often warn their children to abstain from excessive laughter and to avoid words that denote a rash character. That is the mark of stupidity, the evidence of passion. Moreover, children should be warned not ever to speak on those matters that are base in the act. Therefore, mothers should restrain them from vulgar or cutting words. If their children should say anything that is obscene or licentious, mothers should not greet it with a laugh or a kiss, but with a whip.

Moreover, they should teach their children not to criticize anyone because of his poverty or the low birth of his lineage or other misfortunes, for they are sure to make bitter enemies from such actions or develop an attitude of arrogance. Mothers should teach their children sports in which they so willingly learn to exert themselves that, if the occasion arises, they can easily bear even more difficult hardships. I would have mothers sharply criticized for displays of anger, greed, or sexual desire in the presence of their offspring, for these vices weaken virtue. If mothers act appropriately, their children will learn from infancy to condemn, avoid, and hate these most filthy mistresses and they will take care to revere the names of God and will be afraid to take them in vain. For whoever has been taught at an early age to despise the Divinity, will they not as adults surely curse Him? Therefore, it is of great importance to train children from infancy so that they never swear. Indeed, those who swear readily because of some misfortune are not deserving of trust, and those who readily swear very often unwittingly betray themselves. Mothers ought to teach their children to speak the truth.

Therefore, my Lorenzo, your compatriots ought to be stirred by your example and follow you with great enthusiasm, for in Ginevra you have taken a wife who is a virgin well endowed with virtue charm, a noble lineage, and great wealth. What more outstanding, more worthy model could I propose than yours? What more shining, more worthy example than yours, since in this outstanding city of Florence you are most eminently connected through your father, grandfather, and ancestors? You have taken a wife whose great wealth the entire world indeed admires but whose chastity, constancy, and prudence all men of goodwill esteem highly. They consider that you are blessed and happy to have her as a wife, and she is to have you as a husband. Since you have contracted such an outstanding and fine marriage, these same men ask God Immortal that you will have the best children who will become very honored citizens in your state. These matters might perhaps seem negligible since I am treating them, but indeed they are, in their own fashion, borne out in your marriage. Thus, surely young men who follow your example will profit more than only by following my precepts; just as laws are much more likely to be observed in a city when they are obeyed by its ruler, so, since your own choice of a wife is consistent with my teachings, we may hope that these precepts will be followed by the youth.

Questions:
1. What elements are considered important for a wife in contracting and in maintaining a marriage?
2. What is the role of marriage in Renaissance society? What does marriage have to do with larger concerns? Consider, for instance, the ruling of the state, the extended family, politics, economics, etc.
PART 11

The Reformation

11.1 Erasmus: A Diatribe Against the Pope

Desiderius Erasmus (ca. 1467–1536), the most renowned of all Northern Renaissance humanists, was Dutch by birth and educated in a school of the Brethren of the Common Life. He was a Biblical scholar, a popular author, and an astute critic of his society and the church, although he ultimately rejected the Protestant Reform. Published anonymously, the following diatribe is directed against Pope Julius II (r. 1503–13), who was known as the Warrior Pope.


DIALOGUE: JULIUS LOCKED OUT OF HEAVEN

Persons Of The Dialogue: Pope Julius II, His Genius Or Guardian Angel, and St. Peter

Scene: Before the Gates of Heaven

JULIUS: What’s the trouble here? Won’t the gates open? I believe the lock as been changed, or else it’s jammed.

GENIUS: Better check to see if you’ve brought the right key. The one for the treasury won’t open this door, you know. But why didn’t you bring both keys? This is the key of power, not of knowledge.

JULIUS: Why, Hell, this is the only one I’ve ever used! I’ve never seen what good the other one was when I’ve had this one.

GENIUS: Me neither, certainly, except that meanwhile we’re locked out.

JULIUS: I’m losing my temper. I’m going to beat on the gate. Hey there! Somebody open this door instantly! What’s the matter, nobody here? What’s holding up the doorman? Asleep, I suppose; probably drunk.

GENIUS: [Aside] This fellow judges everyone by himself.

PETER: It’s a good thing we’ve got a steel door. Otherwise, whoever this is would break down the gates. It must be some giant, or satrap, some sacker of cities. Immortal God! What sewage is this I smell! Well, I certainly won’t open the door. I’ll just peek out this little barred window and see what kind of monster this is. What do you want? Who are you?

JULIUS: If you knew your business, you would greet me with all the heavenly choirs.

PETER: Rather demanding, isn’t he? But first tell me who you are.

JULIUS: As if you couldn’t see who I am.

PETER: See? I certainly see a new and never-before-seen spectacle, not to say a monster.

JULIUS: If you are not completely blind, then, I suppose you know this key, even if you don’t recognize the golden oak on my coat of arms. And you see the triple crown of the Papacy, besides my cloak, glittering all over with jewels and gold.

PETER: Well, I recognize the silver key, all right, though to be sure there is only one, and it is much different from the keys that Christ, the true Pastor of the Church, once put into my keeping. But how should I recognize that crown, so proud that no barbarian tyrant would ever dare wear it, much less someone wishing to be admitted here? As for that cloak, it does nothing for me. I always kick jewels and gold out of the way, and spurn them like trash. But what’s this? Here and there on the key and the crown and the cloak I see the marks of some wretched saloon keeper and impostor, a fellow with my name but not my ways: Simon (Magus), whom I once threw out from the following of Christ for simony.
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JULIUS: Well, let these trifles go, if you’re wise to them. Now I am, if you don’t know, Julius the Ligurian, and if I’m not mistaken you recognize these two letters: P.M. You have learned to read, I presume?

PETER: I guess they stand for Pestis Maxima, the Universal Calamity.

GENIUS: Ha ha ha! This riddle-guesser hit the nail on the head.

JULIUS: No, no! Pontifex Maximus, the Pope’s title.

PETER: If you were three times maximus and greater even than thrice-great Hermes, you wouldn’t be allowed in here unless you were the best of all; that is, a saint.

JULIUS: Well, if it is so necessary to be called a saint, you’re being pretty arrogant to delay opening the gate for me, when you after all these centuries are only called sanctus—saint or holy—but nobody ever calls me anything but sanctissimus—most sainted, most holy. There are six-thousand bulls....

GENIUS: Real bull!

JULIUS: ... in which I am called not only most holy, but by the very name of holiness itself, whenever it pleased me.

GENIUS: By the name of drunkard, too.

JULIUS: I would make ‘em call me the Holiest of the Most Holy Lord Julius.

PETER: Well then, go demand heaven from those flatterers who made you “most holy.” Let the same followers who gave you your holiness save you. Though I suppose you still think there is no difference between being called holy and being holy.

JULIUS: I’m getting angry! If only I could live again, I’d show you about this business of not being holy and not being saved!

PETER: Oh, there’s an indication of a most holy mind! Although I have been watching you narrowly for a long time now, I’ve seen no sign of sanctity in you—nothing but impiety. Why have you led here this new, un-papal army? Here you have brought with you some twenty-thousand men, and I can’t catch sight of a single one who has even a face that is Christian! I see a horrible flood of soldiers with you, smelling of nothing but brothels, drunkenness, and gun powder. I guess they are some kind of bandits, or rather fiends broken out of Hell to storm Heaven. As for you, the more I look the less trace of an apostle do I see about you. First of all, what monstrous thing is this, that you wear the garment of a priest and under it you bristle and rattle with bloody armor? And why such belligerent eyes, such a fierce mouth, such a menacing forehead, such proud and arrogant brows? It is shameful to say and painful to see that no part of your body is not spattered with the stains of prodigious and abominable pleasures. Not to mention that even now you are belching and smelling of hangover and drunkenness, and I just saw you [vomit]! The appearance of your whole person suggests that it is not with age and disease but through dissipation that you seem old, withered, and broken.

GENIUS: How vividly he paints him in his true colors!...

Questions:
1. How does Pope Julius’ conduct in office as described in the dialogue compare with Machiavelli’s Renaissance prince?
2. On what grounds did St. Peter exclude Pope Julius from heaven?
3. How do these criticisms of Pope Julius compare to John Hus’s condemnation of the papacy?
11.2 Luther’s Ninety-Five Theses

The Ninety-Five Theses is the popular term for the Disputation on the Power and the Efficacy of Indulgences. Luther posted these on the Castle church door at Wittenberg on October 31, 1517. When John Tetzel arrived selling indulgences in Luther’s parish, chanting slogans that offered years off penance in purgatory for a cash payment, Luther protested against them and took the first steps of the Protestant Reformation. A selection of the Theses below reveals Luther’s early position.


Out of love and concern for the truth, and with the object of eliciting it, the following heads will be the subject of a public discussion at Wittenberg under the presidency of the reverend father, Martin Luther, Augustinian, Master of Arts and Sacred Theology, and duly appointed Lecturer on these subjects in that place. He requests that whoever cannot be present personally to debate the matter orally will do so in absence in writing.

1. When our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, said “Repent”, He called for the entire life of believers to be one of penitence.

5. The pope has neither the will nor the power to remit any penalties beyond those imposed either at his own discretion or by canon law.

6. The pope himself cannot remit guilt, but only declare and confirm that it has been remitted by God; or, at most, he can remit it in cases reserved to his discretion. Except for these cases, the guilt remains untouched.

20. Therefore the pope, in speaking of the plenary remission of all penalties, does not mean “all” in the strict sense, but only those imposed by himself.

21. Hence those who preach indulgences are in error when they say that a man is absolved and saved from every penalty by the pope’s indulgences;

22. There is no divine authority for preaching that the soul flies out of purgatory immediately the money chinks in the bottom of the chest.

27. It is certainly possible that when the money chinks in the bottom of the chest avarice and greed increase; but when the church offers intercession, all depends on the will of God.

32. All those who believe themselves certain of their own salvation by means of letters of indulgence, will be eternally damned, together with their teachers.

35. It is not in accordance with Christian doctrine to preach and teach that those who buy off souls, or purchase confessional licenses, have no need to repent of their own sins.

36. Any Christian whatsoever, who is truly repentant, enjoys plenary remission from penalty and guilt, and this is given him without letters of indulgence.

37. Any true Christian whatsoever, living or dead, participates in all the benefits of Christ and the Church; and this participation is granted to him by God without letters of indulgence.

43. Christians should be taught that one who gives to the poor, or lends to the needy, does a better action than if he purchases indulgences.

45. Christians should be taught that he who sees a needy person, but passes him by although he gives money for indulgences, gains no benefit from the pope’s pardon, but only incurs the wrath of God.

50. Christians should be taught that, if the pope knew the exactions of the indulgence preacher he would rather the church of St. Peter were reduced to ashes than be built with the skin, flesh, and bones of his sheep.

62. The true treasure of the church is the Holy Gospel of the glory and the grace of God.

75. It is foolish to think that papal indulgences have so much power that they can absolve a man even if he has done the impossible and violated the mother of God.

76. We assert the contrary, and say that the pope’s pardons are not able to remove the least venial of sins as far as their guilt is concerned.

81. This unbridled preaching of indulgences makes it difficult for learned men to guard the respect due to the pope against false accusations, or at least from the keen criticisms of the laity;

82. They ask, e.g.: Why does not the pope liberate everyone from purgatory for the sake of love (a most holy thing) and because of the supreme necessity of their souls? This would be morally the best of all reasons. Meanwhile he redeems innumerable souls for money, a most perishable thing, with which to build St. Peter’s church, a very minor purpose.
86. Again: Since the pope’s income to-day is larger than that of the wealthiest of wealthy men, why does he not build this one church of St. Peter with his own money, rather than with the money of indigent believers?

90. These questions are serious matters of conscience to the laity. To suppress them by force alone, and not to refute them by giving reasons, is to expose the church and the pope to the ridicule of their enemies, and to make Christian people unhappy.

91. If, therefore, indulgences were preached in accordance with the spirit and mind of the pope, all these difficulties would be easily overcome, and, indeed, cease to exist.

94. Christians should be exhorted to be zealous to follow Christ, their Head, through penalties, deaths, and hells;

95. And let them thus be more confident of entering heaven through many tribulations rather than through a false assurance of peace.

Questions:
1. Why is Luther upset about the sale of indulgences?
2. According to these statements, what is more important in Christian teaching than indulgences?
11.3 The Act of Supremacy: The Church of England

Thwarted by the pope’s reluctance from getting an annulment of his marriage, Henry VIII (r. 1509–1547) invoked the principle “the king in Parliament can do anything” to validate by legislation his new position as head of the Church of England. The new Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, granted the king his annulment and Henry married Anne Boleyn.


ALBEIT the king’s majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be the supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognized by the clergy of this realm in their Convocations, yet nevertheless for corroboration and confirmation thereof, and for increase of virtue in Christ’s religion within this realm of England, and to repress and extirp all errors, heresies, and other enormities and abuses heretofore used in the same: be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the king our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called Anglicana Ecclesia; and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, preeminent, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits, and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the same Church belonging and appertaining; and that our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained, or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God, the increase of virtue in Christ’s religion, and for the conservation of the peace, unity, and tranquillity of this realm; any usage, custom, foreign law, foreign authority, prescription, or any other thing or things to the contrary hereof notwithstanding.

Questions:
1. On what grounds did Henry claim the right to exercise authority as “Supreme Head of the Church of England”?
2. How does this law change the relationship between church and state government? between England and other European states?
11.4 A Protestant Woman Argues for Tolerance

In the initial zeal of the Protestant Reformation, women frequently played important roles. Catherine, a cabinetmaker’s daughter of Strasbourg (Ca. 1497–1562), married Matthew Zell, an ex-priest turned Lutheran minister. The following selection is from a series of letters she wrote to an angry young Lutheran minister named Ludwig Rabus, whose loathing for the radical protestant movement turned him against the Zells. Now a widow and seeking to vindicate herself, Catherine published the correspondence, consisting chiefly of her own letters.

I, Catherine Zell, wife of the late lamented Mathew Zell, who served in Strasbourg, where I was born and reared and still live, wish you peace and enhancement in God’s grace.

From my earliest years I turned to the Lord, who taught and guided me, and I have at all times, in accordance with my understanding and His grace, embraced the interests of His church and earnestly sought Jesus. Even in youth this brought me the regard and affection of clergymen and others much concerned with the church, which is why the pious Mathew Zell wanted me as a companion in marriage; and I, in turn, to serve the glory of Christ, gave devotion and help to my husband, both in his ministry and in keeping his house....

Ever since I was ten years old I have been a student and a sort of church mother, much given to attending sermons. I have loved and frequented the company of learned men, and I conversed much with them, not about dancing, masquerades, and worldly pleasures but about the kingdom of God.

Yet I resisted and struggled against that kingdom. Then, as no learned man could find a way of consoling me in my sins, prayers and physical suffering, and as none could make me sure of God’s love and grace, I fell gravely ill in body and spirit. I became like that poor woman of the Gospel who, having spent all she had on doctors to no avail, heard speak of Christ, went to Him, and was healed. As I foundered, devoured by care and anxiety, vainly searching for serenity in the practices of the church, God took pity on me. From among our people He drew out and sent forth Martin Luther. This man so persuaded me of the ineffable goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ that I felt myself snatched from the depths of hell and transported to the kingdom of heaven. I remembered the Lord’s words to Peter: ‘Follow me and I shall make you a fisher of men’. Then did I labor day and night to cleave to the path of divine truth....

While other women decorated their houses and ornamented themselves, going to dances, wedding parties, and giving themselves to pleasure, I went into the houses of poor and rich alike, in all love, faith, and compassion, to care for the sick and the confined and to bury the dead. Was that to plant anxiety and turmoil in the church of Strasbourg?...

Consider the poor Anabaptists, who are so furiously and ferociously persecuted. Must the authorities everywhere be incited against them, as the hunter drives his dog against wild animals? Against those who acknowledge Christ the Lord in very much the same way we do and over which we broke with the papacy? Just because they cannot agree with us on lesser things, is this any reason to persecute them and in them Christ, in whom they fervently believe and have often professed in misery, in prison, and under the torments of fire and water?

Governments may punish criminals, but they should not force and govern belief which is a matter for the heart and conscience not for temporal authorities.

[Urges Rabus to consult the leading reformers on this question and provides him, ironically, with a list.]

... When the authorities pursue one, they soon bring forth tears, and towns and villages are emptied...
Strasbourg does not offer the example of an evil town but rather the contrary-charity, compassion, and hospital-
ity for the wretched and poor. Within its walls, God be thanked, there remains more than one poor Christian whom certain
people would have liked to see cast out. Old Mathew Zell would not have approved of that: he would have gathered the
sheep, not destroyed them....

Whether they were Lutherans, Zwinglians, Schwenkfeldians, or poor Anabaptist brethren, rich or poor, wise or
foolish, according to the word of St. Paul, all came to us [to the Zells in Strasbourg]. We were not compelled to hold the
same views and beliefs that they did, but we did owe to all a proof of love, service, and generosity: our teacher Christ has
taught us that....

**Questions:**
1. What activities did Catherine and her husband engage in?
2. Why did Rabus criticize her and how did she defend herself?
11.5 The Edict of Nantes

At the end of decades of religious strife, Henry IV of France (r. 1589–1610) decreed the Edict of Nantes, granting religious toleration to the French Protestants, known as Huguenots. This is the first time in European history that a Christian ruler permitted civil liberty as well as freedom of worship to a religious minority.


Firstly, that the memory of everything done on both sides from the beginning of the month of March 1585, until our accession to the Crown and during the other previous troubles, and at the outbreak of them, shall remain extinct and suppressed, as if it were something which had never occurred. And it shall not be lawful or permissible to our Procurators-General or to any other persons, public or private, at any time or on any pretext whatsoever, to institute a case, lawsuit or action in any Court or judicial tribunals whatever [concerning those things].

We forbid all our subjects, of whatever rank and quality they may be, to renew the memory of these matters, to attack, be hostile to, injure or provoke each other in revenge for the past, whatever may be the reason and pretext; or to dispute, argue or quarrel about it, or to do violence, or to give offence in deed or word, but let them restrain themselves and live peaceably together as brothers, friends and fellow-citizens, on pain of being liable to punishment as disturbers of the peace and trouble of public quiet.

We ordain that the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion shall be restored and re-established in all places and districts of this our kingdom and the countries under our rule, where its practice has been interrupted, so that it can be peacefully and freely practiced there, without any disturbance or hindrance. We forbid very expressly all persons of whatever rank, quality or condition they may be, under the aforesaid penalties, to disturb, molest or cause annoyance to clerics in the celebration of the Divine worship, the enjoyment and receipt of tithes, fruits and revenues of their benefices, and all other rights and duties which belong to them; and we ordain that all those who during the disorders have come into possession of churches, houses, goods and revenues belonging to the said clerics, and who retain and occupy them, shall give back the entire possession and enjoyment of them, with such rights, liberties and safeguards as they had before they were seized. We also forbid very expressly those of the so-called Reformed religion to hold prayer meetings or any devotions of the aforesaid religion in churches, houses and dwellings of the above-said clerics....

And in order not to leave any cause for discords and disputes between our subjects, we have permitted and we permit those of the so-called Reformed religion to live and dwell in all the towns and districts of this our kingdom and the countries under one rule, without being annoyed, disturbed, molested or constrained to do anything against their conscience, or for this cause to be sought out in their houses and districts where they wish to live, provided that they conduct themselves in other respects according to the provisions of our present Edict....

We also permit those of the aforesaid religion to carry on and continue its practice in the towns and districts under our rule, where it was established and carried out publicly several distinct times in the year 1597, until the end of the month of March, notwithstanding all decrees and judgments to the contrary....

We forbid very expressly all those of the aforesaid religion to practice it in so far as ministration, regulation, discipline or public instruction of children and others is concerned, in this our kingdom and the countries under our rule, in matters concerning religion, outside the places permitted and conceded by the present Edict....

Books dealing with the matters of the aforesaid so-called Reformed religion shall not be printed and sold publicly, except in the towns and districts where the public exercise of the said religion is allowed. And with regard to other books which shall be printed in other towns, they shall be seen and inspected by our officials and theologians as laid down by our ordinances. We forbid very specifically the printing, publication and sale of all defamatory books, tracts and writings, under the penalties contained in our ordinances, instructing all our judges and officials to carry out this ruling strictly.

We ordain that there shall be no difference or distinction, because of the aforesaid religion, in the reception of students to be instructed in Universities, Colleges and schools, or of the sick and poor into hospitals, infirmaries and public charitable institutions....

In order to reunite more effectively the wills of our subjects, as is our intention, and to remove all future complaints, we declare that all those who profess or shall profess the aforesaid so-called Reformed religion are capable of holding and exercising all public positions, honours, offices and duties whatsoever, Royal, seigneurial, or offices in the towns of our kingdom, countries, lands and lordships subject to us, notwithstanding all contrary oaths, and of being admitted and received into them without distinction; it shall be sufficient for our courts of Parliament and other judges to ascertain and inquire concerning the life, morals, religion and honest behaviour of those who are or shall be appointed to offices, whether of one religion or the other, without enacting from them any oath other than that of well and faithfully serving the King.
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in the exercise of their functions and keeping the ordinances, as has been perpetually the custom. During vacancies in the aforesaid positions, functions and offices, we shall make—in respect of those which shall be in our disposition—appointments without bias or discrimination of capable persons, as the unity of our subjects requires it. We declare also that members of the aforesaid so-called Reformed religion can be admitted and received into all Councils, conferences, assemblies and gatherings which are connected with the offices in question; they can not be rejected or prevented from enjoying these rights on grounds of the said religion....

And for greater security of the behaviour and conduct which we expect with regard to it [the Edict], we will, command and desire that all the Governors and Lieutenants-General of our provinces, Bailiffs, Seneschals and other ordinary judges in towns in our aforesaid kingdom, immediately after the reception of this Edict, swear to cause it to be kept and observed, each one in his own district; likewise the mayors, sheriffs, captains, consuls and magistrates of the towns, annual and perpetual. We also enjoin our said bailiffs, seneschals or their lieutenants and other judges, to cause the principal inhabitants from both religions in the above-mentioned towns to swear to respect the present Edict immediately after its publication. We place all those of the said towns in our protection and safe keeping, each religion being placed in the safe keeping of the other; and we wish them to be instructed respectively and by public acts to answer by due legal process any contraventions of our present Edict which shall be made in the said towns by their inhabitants, or to make known the said contraventions and put them into the hand of justice.

We command our beloved and loyal people who hold our Courts of Parliament, “Chambres des Comptes” and courts of aids that immediately after the present Edict has been received, they are bound, all business being suspended and under penalty of nullity for any acts which they shall make otherwise, to take an oath similar to the above and to make this our Edict to be published and registered in our above-mentioned Courts according to its proper form and meaning, purely and simply, without using any modifications, rectifications, declarations or secret registering and without waiting for further order or commandment from us; and we order our Procurators-General to demand and ensure immediately and without delay the aforesaid publication....

For such is our pleasure. As witness thereof we have signed the present enactment with our own hand, and in order that it may be sure and stable permanently, we have placed and affixed our Seal to it.

Given at Nantes in the month of April, in the year of grace 1598, the ninth year of our reign.

[Signed.]
Henry

Questions:
1. What specific rights did this edict allow the Huguenots?
2. To what extent were they still treated differently from the Catholic majority?
3. How might they become a threat someday to royal authority?
11.6 The Catholic Response: The Council of Trent

The response of the Catholic Church to the Protestant Reformation began, surprisingly, after the election of Pope Paul III (1534–1549), a humanist who immediately appointed his unqualified teenaged grandsons to the college of cardinals. Not only did this action reveal his immoral life, but also his willingness to use his office to increase the wealth and power of his family. Nevertheless, Paul III also appointed able and reform-minded men to offices of authority and called a Church council to deal with the many problems facing the Church. The Council of Trent met intermittently from 1545–1563. Some of its canons and decrees are recorded in the following document.


DEGREE TOUCHING THE OPENING OF THE COUNCIL

Doth it please you-unto the praise and glory of the holy and undivided Trinity, Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; for the increase and exaltation of the Christian faith and religion; for the extirpation of heresies; for the peace and union of the Church; for the reformation of the Clergy and Christian people; for the depression and extinction of the enemies of the Christian name-to decree and declare that the sacred and general council of Trent do begin, and hath begun?

They answered: It pleaseth us.

DEGREE CONCERNING ORIGINAL SIN

That our Catholic faith, without which it is impossible to please God, may, errors being purged away, continue in its own perfect and spotless integrity, and that the Christian people may not be carried about with every wind of doctrine; whereas that old serpent, the perpetual enemy of mankind, amongst the very many evils with which the Church of God is in these our times troubled, has also stirred up not only new, but even old, dissensions touching original sin, and the remedy thereof; the sacred and holy, œcuménical and general Synod of Trent,—lawfully assembled in the Holy See presiding therein,—wishing now to come to the reclaiming of the erring, and the confirming of the wavering—following the testimonies of the sacred Scriptures, of the holy Fathers, or the most approved councils, and the judgement and consent of the Church itself, ordains, confesses, and declares these things touching the said original sin:

1. If any one does not confess that the first man, Adam, when he had transgressed the commandment of God in Paradise, immediately lost the holiness and justice wherein he had been constituted; and that he incurred, through the offense of that prevarication, the wrath and indignation of God, and consequently death, with which God had previously threatened him, and, together with death, captivity under his power who thenceforth had the empire of death, that is to say, the devil, and that the entire Adam, through that offence of prevarication, was changed, in body and soul, for the worse; let him be anathema.

3. If any one asserts, that this sin of Adam—which in its origin is one, and being transfused into all by propagation, not by imitation, is in each one as his own—is taken away either by the powers of human nature, or by any other remedy than the merit of the one mediator our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath reconciled us to God in his own blood, made unto us justice, sanctification, and redemption; or if he denies that the said merit of Jesus Christ is applied, both to adults and to infants, by the sacrament of baptism rightly administered in the form of the Church; let him be anathema....

ON THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL

Canon I. If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord; or, that they are more, or less, than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be anathema.

Canon IV. If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law are not necessary unto salvation, but superfluous; and that, without them, or without the desire thereof, men obtain of God, through faith alone, the grace of justification;—though all (the sacraments) are not indeed necessary for every individual; let him be anathema.
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Canon VI. If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify; or, that they do not confer that grace on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto; as though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith, and certain marks of the Christian profession, whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers; let him be anathema.

Canon X. If any one saith, that all Christians have power to administer the word, and all the sacraments; let him be anathema.

ON THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST

Canon I. If any one deny, that, in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ: but saith that He is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or virtue: let him be anathema.

Canon II. If anyone saith that in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood—the species only of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation; let him be anathema.

ON THE ECCLESIASTICAL HIERARCHY, AND ON ORDINATION

... If any one affirm, that all Christians indiscriminately are priests of the New Testament, or that they are all mutually endowed with an equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy; which is as an army set in array....

.... It decree, that all those who, being only called and instituted by the people, or by the civil power and magistrate, ascend to the exercise of these ministrations, and those who of their own rashness assume them to themselves, are not ministers of the Church, but are to be looked upon as thieves and robbers, who have not entered by the door. These are the things which it hath seemed good to the sacred Synod to teach the faithful of Christ, in general terms, touching the sacrament of Order.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY

Canon IX. If anyone saith, that clerics constituted in sacred orders or Regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract marriage, and that being contracted it is valid, notwithstanding the ecclesiastical law, or vow: and that the contrary is nothing else than to condemn marriage: and, that all who do not feel that they have the gift of chastity; even though they have made a vow thereof, may contract marriage: let him be anathema: seeing that God refuses not that gift to those who ask for it rightly; neither does He suffer us to be tempted above that which we are able.

Canon X. If anyone saith, that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity and of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity, or in celibacy, than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema.

ON THE INVOCATION, VENERATION, AND RELICS, OF SAINTS, AND ON SACRED IMAGES

The holy Synod enjoins on all bishops and others who sustain the office and charge of teaching, that, agreeably to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and agreeably to the consent of the holy Fathers, and to the decrees of sacred Councils, they especially instruct the faithful diligently concerning the intercession and invocation of saints; the honour (paid) to relics; and the legitimate use of images; teaching them that the saints who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men, that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid; (and) help for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son, Jesus Christ, our lord, who is alone Redeemer and Saviour; but that they think impiously, who denies that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked or who assert either that they do not pray for men; or, that the invocation of them to pray for each of us even in particular is idolatry or that it is repugnant to the word of God; and is opposed to the honour of the one mediator between God and me, Christ Jesus; or that it is foolish to supplicate, vocally or mentally, those who reign in heaven. Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ.... They who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of saints; or, that these, and other sacred monuments, are uselessly honoured by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are in vain visited with the view of obtaining their aid; are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned, and now also condemns.
CARDINALS AND ALL PRELATES OF THE CHURCHES SHALL BE CONTENT WITH MODEST FURNITURE AND A FRUGAL TABLE: THEY SHALL NOT ENRICH THEIR RELATIVES OR DOMESTICS OUT OF THE PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH

... Wherefore, after the example of our fathers in the Council of Carthage, it not only orders that bishops be content with modest furniture, and a frugal table and diet, but that they also give heed that in the rest of their manner of living, and in their whole house, there be nothing seen that is alien from this holy institution, and which does not manifest simplicity, zeal toward God, and a contempt of vanities. Also, it wholly forbids them to enrich their own kindred or domestics out of the revenues of the church.... It would seem to be a shame, if they did not at the same time shine so pre-eminent in virtue and in the discipline of their lives, as deservedly to draw upon themselves the eyes of all men.

DECREES CONCERNING INDULGENCES

Whereas the power of conferring Indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church; and she has, even in the most ancient times, used the said power, delivered unto her of God; the sacred holy Synod teaches, and enjoins, that the use of Indulgences for the Christian people most salutary, and approved of by the authority of sacred Councils, is to be retained in the Church; and It condemns with anathema those who either assert, that they are useless; or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them. In granting them, however, it desires that, in accordance with the ancient and approved custom in the Church, moderation be observed; lest by excessive facility, Ecclesiastical discipline be enervated. And being desirous that the abuses which have crept therein, and by occasion of which this honourable name of Indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, be amended and corrected....

Questions:
1. For what purposes did the pope call the Council of Trent?
2. How well did it achieve them?
3. What concessions did the Council make to the doctrinal criticisms of the Protestants?
11.7 The Execution of Archbishop Cranmer, 21 March 1556 Related by a Bystander

Thomas Cranmer (1489–1556), archbishop of Canterbury under Henry VIII and Edward VI, was a forceful proponent of the annulment of the marriage between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. During the reign of Henry’s son Edward, he played a key role in shaping Anglican doctrine. When Mary I, a Catholic, came to throne, Cranmer was convicted of heresy and treason and subsequently executed.


But that I know for our great friendships, and long continued love, you look even of duty that I should signify to you of the truth of such things as here chanceth among us; I would not at this time have written to you the unfortunate end, and doubtful tragedy, of Thomas Cranmer late bishop of Canterbury: because I little pleasure take in beholding of such heavy sights. And, when they are once overpassed, I like not to rehearse them again; being but a renewing of my woe, and doubling my grief. For although for his former life, and wretched end, deserves a greater misery, (if any greater might have chanced than chanced unto him), yet, setting aside his offences to God and his country, and beholding the man without his faults, I think there was none that pitied not his case, and bewailed not his fortune, and feared not his own chance, to see so noble a prelate, so grave a counsellor, of so long continued honour, after so many dignities, in his old years to be deprived of his estate, adjudged to die, and in so painful a death to end his life. I have no delight to increase it. Alas, it is too much of itself, that ever so heavy a case should betide to man, and man to deserve it.

But to come to the matter: on Saturday last, being 21 of March, was his day appointed to die. And because the morning was much rainy, the sermon appointed by Mr Dr Cole to be made at the stake, was made in St Mary’s church: whither Dr Cranmer was brought by the mayor and aldermen, and my lord Williams: with whom came divers gentlemen of the shire, sit T. A. Bridges, sit John Browne, and others. Where was prepared, over against the pulpit, an high place for him, that all the people might see him. And, when he had ascended it, he kneeled him down and prayed, weeping tenderly: which moved a great number to tears, that had conceived an assured hope of his conversion and repentance.

When praying was done, he stood up, and, having leave to speak, said, ‘Good people, I had intended indeed to desire you to pray for me; which because Mr Doctor hath desired, and you have done already, I thank you most heartily for it. And now will I pray for myself, as I could best devise for mine own comfort, and say the prayer, word for word, as I have here written it.’ And he read it standing: and after kneeled down, and said the Lord’s Prayer; and all the people on their knees devoutly praying with him.

And then rising, he said, ‘Every man desireth, good people, at the time of their deaths, to give some good exhortation, that other may remember after their deaths, and be the better thereby. So I beseech God grant me grace, that I may speak something, at this my departing, whereby God may be glorified, and you edified.

‘And now I come to the great thing that troubleth my conscience more than any other thing that ever I said or did in my life: and that is, the setting abroad of writings contrary to the truth. Which here now I renounce and refuse, as things written with my hand, contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and written for fear of death, and to save my life, if it might be: and that is, all such bills, which I have written or signed with mine own hand since my degradation: wherein I have written many things untrue. And forasmuch as my hand offended in writing contrary to my heart, therefore my hand shall first be punished: for if I may come to the fire, it shall be first burned. And as for the pope, I refuse him, as Christ’s enemy and antichrist, with all his false doctrine.’

And here, being admonished of his recantation and dissembling, he said, ‘Alas, my lord, I have been a man that all my life loved plainness, and never dissembled till now against the truth; which I am most sorry for it.’ He added hereunto, that, for the sacrament, he believed as he had taught in his book against the bishop of Winchester. And here he was suffered to speak no more.

Then was he carried away; and a great number, that did run to see him go so wickedly to his death, ran after him, exhorting him, while time was, to remember himself. And one Friar John, a godly and well learned man, all the way travelled with him to reduce him. But it would not be. What they said in particular I cannot tell, but the effect appeared in the end: for at the stake he professed, that he died in all such opinions as he had taught, and oft repented him of his recantation.

Coming to the stake with a cheerful countenance and willing mind, he put off his garments with haste, and stood upright in his shirt: and a bachelor of divinity, named Elye, of Brazen-nose college, laboured to convert him to his former recantation, with the two Spanish friars. And when the friars saw his constancy, they said in Latin one to another ‘Let us go from him: we ought not to be nigh him: for the devil is with him.’ But the bachelor in divinity was more earnest with him: unto whom he answered, that, as concerning his recantation, he repented it right sore, because he knew it was against the truth; with other words more. Whereby the Lord Williams cried, ‘Make short, make short.’ Then the bishop took certain of his friends by the hand. But the bachelor of divinity refused to take him by the hand, and blamed all others that so did, and said, he was sorry that ever he came in his company. And yet again he required him to agree to his former recan-
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tation. And the bishop answered, (shewing his hand), ‘This was the hand that wrote it, and therefore shall it suffer first punish-
ishment.’

Fire being now put to him, he stretched out his right hand, and thrust it into the flame, and held it there a good
space, before the fire came to any other part of his body; where his hand was seen of every man sensibly burning, crying
with a loud voice, ‘This hand hath offended.’ As soon as the fire got up, he was very soon dead, never stirring or crying
all the while.

His patience in the torment, his courage in dying, if it had been taken either for the glory of God, the wealth of
his country, or the testimony of truth, as it was for a pernicious error, and subversion of true religion, I could worthily have
commended the example, and matched it with the fame of any father of ancient time: but, seeing that not the death, but
cause and quarrel thereof, commendeth the sufferer, I cannot but much dispraise his obstinate stubbornness and sturdiness
in dying, and specially in so evil a cause. Surely his death much grieved every man; but not after one sort. Some pitied to
see his body so tormented with the fire raging upon the silly carcass, that counted not of the folly. Other that passed not
much of the body, lamented to see him spill his soul, wretchedly, without redemption, to be plagued for ever. His friends
sorrowed for love; his enemies for pity: strangers for a common kind of humanity, whereby we are bound one to another.
Thus I have enforced myself, for your sake, to discourse this heavy narration, contrary to my mind: and, being more than
half weary, I make a short end, wishing you a quieter life, with less honour; and easier death, with more praise.

**Question:**
1. Does the writer demonstrate any ambivalence about the execution of Cranmer?
11.8 A Right with Roots in the Bible

The Spanish missionary Bartolome de Las Casas (1574–1576) first visited the Americas in 1502. Appalled by what he saw, he devoted his life to improving the lot of the indigenous people of the New World. Central to his mission was a clear conviction that, as human beings, the peoples of the Americas had rights that Europeans had to respect.


### PREACHING THE GOSPEL TRUTH

It had been nineteen years now since the inhabitants of the so-called Indies had begun to suffer foreign occupation, with its attendant abuse, exploitation, and death at the hands of the “discoverers” (from the European viewpoint) of these lands. The natives were treated “as if they had been useless animals,” and the colonists “mourned their deaths only for reason of the inconvenience that now they would no longer be able to work the gold mines and plantations for them,” since the Europeans only sought “to grow rich on the blood of those wretches.” Sorrowfully the friars asked: “How can so very many people that there had been on this island, according to what we have been told, in such a brief time, a space of fifteen or sixteen years, have so cruelly perished?” The allusion is to the horrible decimation of the population of the island, which we have seen.

A consideration of the “sorrowful life and awful captivity suffered by the native people of this island” now led the Dominican religious of Hispaniola to “set the facts of the case over against the principles of justice and right”—**juntar el derecho con el hecho**, as they put it. That is, it moved them to submit their knowledge of the situation to an ethical reflection and to confront the oppression they saw before them with the “law of Christ” (*H.I.*, bk. 3, ch. 3, O.E. 2:174a–b). On that law is based the right which Las Casas says “must be proclaimed.” After all, he goes on, “Are we not obliged to preach the law of Christ to them, and to labor with all diligence to convert them?” (*ibid.*).

Nor was this act of **juntar el derecho con el hecho** to be a mere speculative enterprise on the Dominicans’ part. It would move them to make a decision, “after commending themselves to God,” to “preach in the public pulpits, and to declare, the state in which our sinful compatriots have held and oppressed these people.” Thus they would be performing their function as preachers. Las Casas then makes the ironic observation that it was necessary to call the oppressors’ attention to the fact that, by dying in this sin, “as the crown of their inhumanities and greed, they were assuring themselves of their reward.” Las Casas remarks the role played in this decision by a former conquistador, Juan Garcés. Garcés had repented his crimes and after passing through a number of personal difficulties had become a “lay friar” of the Dominicans. To the wonder and admiration of the religious, he straightforwardly recounted the “execrable cruelties” that he and others had committed against the Indians (*H.I.*, bk. 3, ch. 3, O.E. 2:174b–175a).

The Dominicans (“spiritual individuals,” Bartolomé calls them, “and very much the friends of God”; *ibid.*, O.E. 2:174b), aware of the gravity of the matter, composed, and all signed, the sermon to be delivered by Friar Antón Montesino (as Las Casas writes the name), whom he calls a great preacher and “most severe in the reprehension of vices. They selected the Fourth Sunday of Advent and took as their text John the Baptist’s cry, “I am a ‘voice in the desert... ’” (John 1:23). They invited all of the notables of the island, among them Admiral Diego Colón, to sit and listen (*ibid.*, O.E. 2:175). The content of the sermon is known to us only in Las Casas’s version, which—even if he has placed, decades later, something of his own there—is basically authentic, as reactions to the sermon, which we know from other sources as well, credibly attest.

The text is familiar enough, but in view of its historical importance, and especially its influence on our friar’s thought, it will be worth our while to examine it here. Las Casas reports that, in keeping with the spirit of the gospel reading for that Sunday, the preacher began with an observation on the “sterility of the desert of the consciences” of those present. Montesino then claims to be the voice crying on that bleak and barren plain.
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Let us reproduce verbatim what Friar Bartolomé reports:

You are all in mortal sin! You live in it and you die in it! Why? Because of the cruelty and tyranny you use with these innocent people. Tell me, with what right, with what justice, do you hold these Indians in such cruel and horrible servitude? On what authority have you waged such detestable wars on these people, in their mild, peaceful lands, where you have consumed such infinitudes of them, wreaking upon them this death and unheard-of havoc? How is it that you hold them so crushed and exhausted, giving them nothing to eat, nor any treatment for their diseases, which you cause them to be infected with through the surfeit of their toils, so that they “die on you” [as you say]—you mean, you kill them—mining gold for you day after day? And what care do you take that anyone catechize them, so that they may come to know their God and Creator, be baptized, hear Mass, observe Sundays and Holy Days? Are they not human beings? Have they no rational souls? Are you not obligated to love them as you love yourselves? Do you not understand this? Do you not grasp this? How is it that you sleep so soundly, so lethargically? Know for a certainty that in the state in which you are you can no more be saved than Moors or Turks who have not, nor wish to have, the faith of Jesus Christ. (H.I. , bk. 3, ch. 4, O.E. 2:176)

Many of the burning questions that would be debated over the next half-century and more are present in seed here. The first fact that provokes the friars’ indignation is the oppression of the Indian, of which they themselves are direct and daily witnesses. The natives are subjected to a “horrible servitude,” and a lethal one, as they toil in the mines “for gold, day after day.” The tragic relationship between greed and death thus makes its appearance in the very first denunciation. Second, this deadly exploitation—this murder—has only been a prolongation of the initial injustice: that of the “detestable wars” that had been waged against the Indians, for no just reason whatever. Third, Montesino ridicules the official pretext for the encomiendas: What genuine concern is there, he scoffs, on the part of the oppressors for the Christian life of their native victims?

The friars go even further. To these three denunciations they add, speaking through the mouth of Montesino, a consideration that will become the material of a distinct tractate. After all, the Indians are persons, and consequently have all the rights of persons. “Are they not human beings? Have they no rational souls?” The preacher’s premise is destined to be an important one in the great dispute launched by his sermon. But for Montesino, this humanistic proposition is only a stepping stone to an exigency of the gospel: “Are you not then obliged to love them as yourselves?” This radical Christian requirement, which supposes equality (“as yourselves”) between Spaniards and Indians before God, goes beyond the duties of justice, which has been so treacherously violated. It transfers the problem to new ground: that of love, which knows no juridical or philosophic limits.

This evangelical perspective, it seems to us, is the key to an understanding of the Dominicans’ mighty challenge. The elaborate theology of law being developed at about this same time by Vitoria Domingo de Soto, and others, based on the thought of Thomas Aquinas, has recently occasioned a retrospective interpretation of the missionaries’ theological stance in the light of the jus gentium, or Law of Nations—if not indeed of natural law and its theological implications. This is what occurs, it seems to us, in the case of V. Carro, author of a classic work on the sixteenth-century theologians of law. Carro builds his exegesis of the sermon on the pertinent questions—“Are they not human beings? Have they no rational souls?”—and asserts that the friars have indicated the route “the theology of law will take, from that point onward, to give life to the best elements of the Laws of the Indies, the route that theologians like Vitoria and de Soto will develop and broaden.... These expressions will give rise to the theories that legal theology will posit for the protection of the rights inherent in human personhood. Very precisely, Montesino reflects the correct teaching, one having its roots in the principles of St. Thomas.”

But Carro fails to go on to the next question, which recalls human siblingship along such demanding evangelical lines: “Are you not obliged to love them as yourselves?” Shortly before quoting the text of Montesino’s sermon, in a reference to the moment at which the friars decided to denounce “the deeds that the Spaniards were perpetrating upon the Indians,” Las Casas sets forth some of the concepts that will be contained in that sermon. In the face of the “ugliness and enormity of such unheard-of injustice,” he says, surely we shall have to ask: “Are these not humans? Need not the precepts of charity and justice be kept in our dealings with them?” (H.I. , bk. 3, ch. 3, O.E. 2:174b; emphasis added). And indeed, uppermost in the Dominicans’ mind is the ever new commandment of love.
We are not attempting to set up a facile opposition between the theologico-juridical foundations and the exigencies of the gospel. But we do think it important to call attention to the difference in their quality and extension. After all, without the gospel, the foundations of a theology of law lack their proper, vital context. The various questions of Montesino’s homily are interconnected, of course. But the one that recalls the Indian’s quality as “neighbor” to the Spaniards, which the missioners see as entailing a duty to love, is the furthest-reaching question, and the one that gives meaning to the others.

In a penetrating and frequently cited passage, Chacón y Calvo asserts, apropos of the sermon upon which we are commenting: “At this solemn moment, in the humble residence of a few courageous friars, a new system of law sprang into being, a law with deep theological roots.” And a law with deep biblical roots, let us add, since the power of the cry of Hispaniola is truly rooted in the Bible.

Question:
1. What is behind Las Casas’ view of the rights of the native population?
12.1 The German Peasant’s Revolt: The Twelve Articles

Luther’s stand against pope and emperor coincided with the growing anger and resentment of peasants and urban workers against noble authority. The following year the leaders of the peasants in the southwest German area drew up a manifesto of their demands. Sympathetic to their grievances, yet opposed to social revolution and disruption of public order, Luther urged the peasants to refrain from violence and seek a peaceful resolution. When the nobility disdainfully rejected the Articles, however, a bloody and destructive peasant rebellion erupted that was brutally crushed. Luther sternly approved of the retaliation because of the death and destruction that the rebels’ violence had caused.


Peace to the Christian reader and the grace of God through Christ:  
There are many evil writings put forth of late which take occasion, on account of the assembling of the peasants, to cast scorn upon the Gospel, saying: “Is this the fruit of the new teaching, that no one should obey but all should everywhere rise in revolt, and rush together to reform, or perhaps destroy entirely, the authorities, both ecclesiastical and lay?” The articles below shall answer these godless and criminal fault-finders, and serve, in the first place, to remove the reproach from the word of God and, in the second place, to give a Christian excuse for the disobedience or even the revolt of the entire Peasantry....

The Second Article According as the just tithe [a tax paid in grain] is established by the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New, we are ready and willing to pay the fair tithe of grain. The word of God plainly provides that in giving... to God and distributing to his people the services of a pastor are required. We will that for the future our church provost [manager of a feudal estate], whomsover the community may appoint, shall gather and receive this tithe. From this he shall give to the pastor, elected by the whole community, a decent and sufficient maintenance for him and his, as shall seem right to the whole community.... The small tithes,* whether ecclesiastical or lay, we will not pay at all, for the Lord God created cattle for the free use of man. We will not, therefore, pay farther an unseemly tithe which is of man’s invention.

The Third Article It has been the custom hitherto for men to hold us as their own property, which is pitiable enough, considering that Christ has delivered and redeemed us all, without exception, by the shedding of his precious blood, the lowly as well as the great. Accordingly it consists with Scripture that we should be free and should wish to be so. Not that we would wish to be absolutely free and under no authority. God does not teach us that we should lead a disorderly life in the lusts of the flesh, but that we should love the Lord our God and our neighbor. We would gladly observe all this as God has commanded us in the celebration of the communion. He has not commanded us not to obey the authorities, but rather that we should be humble, not only towards those in authority, but towards every one. We are thus ready to yield obedience according to God’s law to our elected and regular authorities in all proper things becoming to a Christian. We therefore take it for granted that you will release us from serfdom as true Christians, unless it should be shown us from the gospel that we are serfs....

---

* This is, tithes of other products than the staple crops—for example, tithes of pigs or lambs.
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The Tenth Article  In the tenth place, we are aggrieved by the appropriation by individuals of meadows and fields which at one time belonged to a community. These we will take again into our own hands. It may, however, happen that the land was rightfully purchased, but when the land has unfortunately been purchased in this way, some brotherly arrangement should be made according to circumstances.

The Eleventh Article  In the eleventh place, we will entirely abolish the due called [heriot, a death tax], and will no longer endure it nor allow widows and orphans to be thus shamefully robbed against God’s will....

Questions:
1. What influence did Luther’s reformation doctrine have on these Articles?
2. What were their social and political demands?
12.2 Elizabeth’s Act of Uniformity, 1559

When Elizabeth I (1533–1603) came to the throne in 1558, England had endured more than twenty years of religious upheaval. The Act of Uniformity of Common Prayer, and Service in Church, and Administration of the Sacraments (1559) was an effort to reach a religious compromise that the majority of Elizabethans could live with. It was, in large measure, a success.


Where at the death of our late sovereign lord King Edward VI there remained one uniform order of common service and prayer, and of the administration of sacraments, rites, and ceremonies in the Church of England, which was set forth in one book, intituled: The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies in the Church of England; authorized by Act of Parliament holden in the fifth and sixth years of our said late sovereign lord King Edward VI, intituled: An Act for the uniformity of common prayer, and administration of the sacraments; the which was repealed and taken away by Act of Parliament in the first year of the reign of our late sovereign lady Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ’s religion:

Be it therefore enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, that the said statute of repeal, and everything therein contained, only concerning the said book, and the service, administration of sacraments, rites, and ceremonies contained or appointed in or by the said book, shall be void and of none effect, from and after the feast of the Nativity of St John Baptist next coming; and that the said book, with the order of service, and of the administration of sacraments, rites, and ceremonies, with the alterations and additions therein added and appointed by this statute, shall stand and be, from and after the said feast of the Nativity Of St John Baptist, in full force and effect, according to the tenor and effect of this statute; anything in the aforesaid statute of repeal to the contrary notwithstanding.

And further be it enacted by the queen’s highness, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by authority of the same, that all and singular ministers in any cathedral or parish church, or other place within this realm of England, Wales, and the marches of the same, or other the queen’s dominions, shall from and after the feast of the Nativity of St John Baptist next coming be bounden to say and use the Matins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord’s Supper and administration of each of the sacraments, and all their common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book, so authorized by Parliament in the said fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward VI, with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the sacrament to the communicants, and none other or otherwise.

And that if any manner of parson, vicar, or other whatsoever minister, that ought or should sing or say common prayer mentioned in the said book, or minister the sacraments, from and after the feast of the Nativity of St John Baptist next coming, refuse to use the said common prayers, or to minister the sacraments in such cathedral or parish church, or other places as he should use to minister the same, in such order and form as they be mentioned and set forth in the said book, or shall, wilfully or obstinately standing in the same, use any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of celebrating of the Lord’s Supper, openly or privily, or Matins, Evensong, administration of the sacraments, or other open prayers, than is mentioned and set forth in the said book (open prayer in and throughout this Act, is meant that prayer which is for other to come unto, or hear, either in common churches or private chapels or oratories, commonly called the service of the Church), or shall preach, declare, or speak anything in the derogation or depraving of the said book, or anything therein contained, or of any part thereof, and shall be thereof lawfully convicted, according to the laws of this realm, by verdict of twelve men, or by his own confession, or by the notorious evidence of the fact, shall lose and forfeit to the queen’s highness, her heirs and successors, for his first offence, the profit of all his spiritual benefices or promotions coming or arising in the one whole year next after his conviction; and also that the person so convicted shall for the same offence suffer imprisonment by the space of six months, without ball or mainprize.

1 Proper Lessons for Sundays were given in 1st P.B. of Edw. VI (1549), but omitted in the 1552 Book.
2 The more important changes were: the omission of the deprecation, ‘From the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities,’ which appeared in 1549 and 1552, and the inclusion of the Prayer of the Queen’s Majesty, and the Prayer for the Clergy and People, which have been, since 1662, included in Morning and Evening Prayer.
3 In the 1549 Book the words of administration were, ‘The body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ which Was given (shed) for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.’ In 1552 there was substituted, ‘Take and eat this (Drink this) in remembrance that Christ died (Christ’s blood was shed) for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving (and be thankful).’ The two forms were combined in 1559 and retained thus in 1662.
And if any such person once convicted of any offence concerning the premises, shall after his first conviction eft-
soons offend, and be thereof, in form aforesaid, lawfully convicted, that then the same person shall for his second offence suffer imprisonment by the space of one whole year, and also shall therefor be deprived, \textit{ipso facto}, of all his spiritual pro-
motions; and that it shall be lawful to all patrons or donors of all and singular the same spiritual promotions, or of any of them, to present or collate to the same, as though the person and persons so offending were dead.

And that if any such person or persons, after he shall be twice convicted in form aforesaid, offend against any of the premises the third time, and shall be thereof, in form aforesaid, lawfully convicted, that then the person so offending and convicted the third time, shall be deprived, \textit{ipso facto}, of all his spiritual promotions, and also shall suffer imprisonment during his life.

And if the person that shall offend, and be convicted in form aforesaid, concerning any of the premises, shall not be benefited, nor have any spiritual promotion, that then the same person so offending and convicted shall for the first offence suffer imprisonment during one whole year next after his said conviction, without bail or mainprize. And if any such person, not having any spiritual promotion, after his first conviction shall eftsoons offend in anything concerning the premises, and shall be, in form aforesaid, thereof lawfully convicted, that then the same person shall for his second offence suffer imprisonment during his life.

And it is ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any person or persons whatsoever, after the said feast of the Nativity of St John Baptist next coming, shall in any interludes, plays, songs, rhymes, or by other open words, declare or speak anything in the derogation, depraving, or despising of the same book, or anything therein contained, or any part thereof, or shall, by open fact, deed, or by open threatenings, compel or cause, or otherwise procure or maintain, any parson, vicar, or other minister in any cathedral or parish church, or in chapel, or in any other place, to sing or say any common or open prayer, or to minister any sacrament otherwise, or in any other manner and form, than is mentioned in the said book; or that by any of the said means shall unlawfully interrupt or let any parson, vicar, or other minister in any cathed-
ral or parish church, chapel, or any other place, to sing or say common and open prayer, or to minister the sacraments or any of them, in such manner and form as is mentioned in the said book; that then every such person, being thereof law-
fully convicted in form abovesaid, shall forfeit to the queen our sovereign lady, her heirs and successors, for the first offence a hundred marks.

And if any person or persons, being once convicted of any such offence, eftsoons offend against any of the last recited offences, and shall, in form aforesaid, be thereof lawfully convicted, that then the same person so offending and convicted shall, for the second offence, forfeit to the queen our sovereign lady, her heirs and successors, four hundred marks.

And if any person, after he, in form aforesaid, shall have been twice convicted of any offence concerning any of the last recited offences, shall offend the third time, and be thereof, in form abovesaid, lawfully convicted, that then every person so offending and convicted shall for his third offence forfeit to our sovereign lady the queen all his goods and chattels, and shall suffer imprisonment during his life.

And if any person or persons, that for his first offence concerning the premises shall be convicted, in form aforesaid, do not pay the sum to be paid by virtue of his conviction, in such manner and form as the same ought to be paid, within six weeks next after his conviction; that then every person so convicted, and so not paying the same, shall for the same first offence, instead of the said sum, suffer imprisonment by the space of six months, without bail or mainprize. And if any person or persons, that for his second offence concerning the premises shall be convicted in form aforesaid, do not pay the said sum to be paid by virtue of his conviction and this statute, in such manner and form as the same ought to be paid, within six weeks next after his said second conviction; that then every person so convicted, and not so paying the same, shall, for the same second offence, in the stead of the said sum, suffer imprisonment during twelve months, without bail or mainprize.

And that from and after the said feast of the Nativity of St John Baptist next coming, all and every person and per-
sons inhabiting within this realm, or any other the queen’s majesty’s dominions, shall diligently and faithfully, having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent, endeavour themselves to resort to their parish church or chapel accustomed, or upon reasonable let thereof, to some usual place where common prayer and such service of God shall be used in such time of let, upon every Sunday and other days ordained and used to be kept as holy days, and then and there to abide orderly and soberly during the time of the common prayer, preachings, or other service of God there to be used and ministered; upon pain of punishment by the censures of the Church, and also upon pain that every person so offending shall forfeit for every such offence twelve pence, to be levied by the churchwardens of the parish where such offence shall be done, to the use of the poor of the same parish, of the goods, lands, and tenements of such offender, by way of distress.
And for due execution hereof, the queen’s most excellent majesty, the Lords temporal (sic), and all the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, do in God’s name earnestly require and charge all the archbishops, bishops, and other ordinaries, that they shall endeavour themselves to the uttermost of their knowledges, that the due and true execution hereof may be had throughout their dioceses and charges, as they will answer before God, for such evils and plagues wherewith Almighty God may justly punish His people for neglecting this good and wholesome law.

Question:
1. Which side in the struggle would have been the most satisfied with this Act? The least?
12.3 The Arrest of the Catholic Priest Edmund Campion and his Associates
17 July 1581—Report of a Government Agent

The English Jesuit Edmund Campion (c. 1540–1581) was ordained a Catholic priest in Douai, a town in what is now northern France but which, in the sixteenth century, was controlled by the Spanish Hapsburgs. He was sent to England as a missionary in 1580 where he devoted himself to preserving Catholicism in England. In 1581 he was captured by the English government, tortured, and then executed. He was made a saint by the Roman Catholic Church in 1970.


It happened that after the receipt of our Commission, we consulted between ourselves, What way were best to take first? For we were utterly ignorant where, or in what place, certainly to find out the said Campion, or his compeers. And our consultation was shortly determined: for the greatest part of our travail and dealings in this service did lie chiefly upon mine own determination, by reason of mine acquaintance and knowledge of divers of the like sect.

It then presently came to my remembrance of certain acquaintance which I once had with one Thomas Cooper a cook, who, in November [1578] was two years, served Master Thomas Roper of [Orpington in] Kent; where, at that time, I in like manner served: and both of us, about the same month, departed the said Master Roper his service; I into Essex, and the said Cooper to Lyford in Berkshire, to one Master Yate. From whence, within one half year after, I was advertised in Essex, that the said Cook was placed in service; and that the said Master Yate was a very earnest Papist, and one that gave great entertainment to any of that sect.

Which tale, being told me in Essex two years before we entered [on] this journey, by God’s great goodness, came to my memory but even the day before we set forth. Hereof I informed the said David Jenkins, being my fellow in Commission, and told him it would be our best way to go thither first: for that it was not meant that we should go to any place but where indeed I either had acquaintance; or by some means possible in our journey, could get acquaintance. And told him we would dispose of our journey in such sort as we might come to the said Master Yate’s upon the Sunday about eight of the clock in the morning: ‘where,’ said I, ‘if we find the said Cook, and that there be any Mass to be said there that day, or any massing Priest in the house; the Cook, for old acquaintance and for that he supposeth me to be a Papist, will bring me to the sight thereof.’

And upon this determination, we set from London the 14th day of July last; and came to the said Master Yate’s house, the 16th of the same month, being Sunday, about the hour aforesaid.

Where, without the gates of the same house, we espied one of the servants of the house, who most likely seemed, by reason of his lying aloof, to be as it were a Scout Watcher, that they within might accomplish their secret matters more safely.

I called the said servant, and inquired of him for the said Thomas Cooper the Cook.

Who answered, That he could not well tell, whether he were within or not.

I prayed him that he would friend me so much as to see; and told him my name.

The said servant did so, it seemed; for the Cook came forth presently unto us where we sat still upon horseback. And after a few such speeches, as betwixt friend and friend when they have been long asunder, were passed; still sitting upon our horses, I told him That I had longed to see him; and that I was then travelling into Derbyshire to see my friends, and came so far out of my way to see him. And said I, ‘Now I have seen you, my mind is well satisfied; and so fare you well!’

‘No,’ saith he, ‘that shall you not do before dinner.’

I made the matter very earnest to be gone; and he, more earnest and importune to stay me. But in truth I was as willing to stay as he to have me.

And so, perforce, there was no remedy but stay we must. And having lighted from horseback; and being by him brought into the house, and so into the buttery, and there caused to drink: presently after, the said Cook came and whispered with me, and asked, Whether my friend (meaning the said Jenkins) were within the Church or not? Therein meaning, Whether he were a Papist or no?

To which I answered, ‘He was not; but yet,’ said I, ‘he is a very honest man, and one that wisheth well that way.’

Then said the Cook to me, ‘Will you go up?’ By which speech, I knew he would bring me to a Mass.

And I answered him and said, ‘Yea, for God’s sake, that let me do: for seeing I must needs tarry, let me take something with me that is good.’
And so we left Jenkins in the buttery; and I was brought by the Cook through the hall, the dining parlour, and two or three other odd rooms, and then into a fair large chamber: where there was, at the same instant, one Priest, called Satwell, saying Mass; two other Priests kneeling by, whereof one was Campion, and the other called Peters alias Collington; three Nuns, and 37 other people.

When Satwell had finished his Mass; then Campion he invested himself to say Mass, and so he did; and at the end thereof, made holy bread and delivered it to the people there, to every one some, together with holy water; whereof he gave me part also.

And then was there a chair set in the chamber something beneath the altar, wherein the said Campion did sit down; and there made a sermon very nigh an hour long: the effect of his text being, as I remember, ‘That Christ wept over Jerusalem, &c.’ And so applied the same to this our country of England for that the Pope his authority and doctrine did not so flourish here as the same Campion desired.

At the end of which sermon, I gat down unto the said Jenkins so soon as I could. For during the time that the Masses and the sermon were made, Jenkins remained still beneath in the buttery or hall; not knowing of any such matter until I gave him some intelligence what I had seen.

And so we departed, with as convenient expedition as we might, and came to one Master Fettiplace, a Justice of the Peace in the said country: whom we made privy of our doings therein; and required him that, according to the tenour of our Commission, he would take sufficient Power, and with us thither.

Whereupon the said Justice of Peace, within one quarter of an hour, put himself in a readiness, with forty or fifty men very well weaponed: who went, in great haste, together with the said Master Fettiplace and us, to the said Master Yate his house.

Where, at our coming upon the sudden, being about one of the clock in the afternoon of the same day, before we knocked at the gates which were then (as before they were continually accustomed to be) fast shut (the house being moated round about; within which moat was great store of fruit trees and other trees, with thick hedgerows: so that the danger for fear of losing of the said Campion and his associates was the more doubted); we beset the house with our men round about the moat in the best sort we could devise: and then knocked at the gates, and were presently heard and espied; but kept out by the space of half an hour.

In which time, as it seemeth, they had hidden Campion and the other two Priests in a very secret place within the said house; and had made reasonable purveyance for him as hereafter is mentioned: and then they let us into the house.

Where came presently to our sight, Mrs Yate, the good wife of the house; five Gentlemen, one Gentlewoman, and three Nuns: the Nuns being then disguised in Gentlewomen’s apparel, not like unto that they heard Mass in. All which I well remembered to have seen, the same morning, at the Masses and Sermon aforesaid: yet every one of them a great while denied it. And especially the said Mistress Yate; who could not be content only to make a plain denial of the said Masses and the Priests: but, with great and horrible oaths, forsware the same, betaking herself to the Devil if any such there were; in such sort as, if I had not seen them with mine own eyes, I should have believed her.

But knowing certainly that these were but bare excuses, and that we should find the said Campion and his compeers if we made narrow search; I eftsoons put Master Fettiplace in remembrance of our Commission: and so he, myself, and the said Jenkins Her Majesty’s Messenger, went to searching the house; where we found many secret corners.

Continuing the search, although with no small toil, in the orchards, hedges, and ditches, within the moat and divers other places; at the last found out Master Edward Yate, brother to the good man of the house, and two countrymen called Weblin and Mansfield, fast locked together in a pigeon house: but we could not find, at that time, Campion and the other two Priests whom we specially sought for.

It drew then something towards evening, and doubting lest we were not strong enough; we sent our Commission to one Master Foster, High Sheriff of Berkshire; and to one Master Wiseman, a justice of Peace within the same County; for some further aid at their hands.

The said Master Wiseman came with very good speed unto us the same evening, with ten or twelve of his own men, very able men and well appointed: but the said Master Foster could not be found, as the messenger that went for him returned us answer.

And so the said house was beset the same night with at the least three score men well weaponed; who watched the same very diligently.

And the next day, being Monday, in the morning very early, came one Master Christopher Lydcot, a Justice of Peace of the same shire, with a great sort of his own men, all very well appointed: who, together with his men, shewed such earnest loyal and forward service in those affairs as was no small comfort and encouragement to all those which were present, and did bear true hearts and good wills to Her Majesty.
The same morning, began a fresh search for the said Priests; which continued with very great labour until about ten of the clock in the forenoon of the same day: but the said Priests could not be found, and every man almost persuaded that they were not there.

Yet still searching, although in effect clean void of any hope for finding of them, the said David Jenkins, by God’s great goodness, espied a certain secret place, which he quickly found to be hollow; and with a pin of iron which he had in his hand much like unto a harrow tine, he forthwith did break a hole into the said place: where then presently he perceived the said Priests lying all close together upon a bed, of purpose there laid for them; where they had bread, meat, and drink sufficient to have relieved them three or four days together.

The said Jenkins then called very loudly, and said, ‘I have found the traitors!’; and presently company enough was with him: who there saw the said Priests, when there was no remedy for them but nolens volens, courteously yielded themselves.

Shortly after came one Master Reade, another justice of the Peace of the said shire, to be assistant in these affairs. Of all which matters, news was immediately carried in great haste to the Lords of the Privy Council: who gave further Commission that the said Priests and certain others their associates should be brought to the Court under the conduction of myself and the said Jenkins; with commandment to the Sheriff to deliver us sufficient aid forth of his shire, for the safe bringing up of the said people.

After the rumour and noise for the finding out of the said Campion, Satwell, and Peters alias Collington, was in the said house something assuaged; and that the sight of them was to the people there no great novelty: then was the said High Sheriff sent for once again; who all that while had not been seen in this service. But then came, and received into his charge the said Priests and certain others from that day until Thursday following.

The fourth Priest which was by us brought up to the Tower, whose name is William Filbie, was not taken with the said Campion and the rest in the said house: but was apprehended and taken in our watch by chance, in coming to the said house to speak with the said Peters, as he said; and thereupon delivered likewise in charge to the Sheriff, with the rest.

Upon Thursday, the 20th day of July last, we set forwards from the said Master Yate his house towards the Court, with our said charge; being assisted by the said Master Lydcot and Master Wiseman, and a great sort of their men; who never left us until we came to the Tower of London. There were besides, that guarded us thither, 50 or 60 Horsemen; very able men and well appointed: which we received by the said Sheriff his appointment.

We went that day to Henley upon Thames, where we lodged that night. And about midnight we were put into great fear by reason of a very great cry and noise that the said Filbie made in his sleep; which wakened the most that were that night in the house, and that in such sort that every man almost thought that some of the prisoners had been broken from us and escaped; although there was in and about the same house a very strong watch appointed and charged for the same. The aforesaid Master Lydcot was the first that came unto them: and when the matter was examined, it was found no more but that the said Filbie was in a dream; and, as he said, he verily thought one to be a ripping down his body and taking out his bowels.

Question:
1. What is revealed about the qualities and character of the people trying to capture the priest?
12.4 The Peace of Westphalia, 1648

The Peace of Westphalia (1648) brought the Thirty Years War to a close. The treaty brought some measure of religious toleration to Europe, contributed to France’s emergence as the dominant power on the continent, and dealt a mortal blow to France’s chief rival, the Holy Roman Empire.


V. Religious Grievances
I. Confirmation of the Convention of Passau and the Peace of Augsburg.
15. The Ecclesiastical Reservation. Catholics or Lutherans holding an ecclesiastical dignity to vacate it and its income if they change their religion.
21. The investiture of Protestant Prelates to take place when they have taken the due oaths.
34. Toleration given to those who, in 1624, had not the right to exercise their religion, being subjects of a lord of the other faith.
35. Subjects whose religion differs from that of their prince are to have equal rights with his other subjects.
36. Those emigrating for religious reasons retain the administration of their property.
43. The religious position in provinces where the lordship is contested.
50. Disputes about the religious peace of Augsburg and the peace of Westphalia to be carried before the diet. All doctrines contrary of these treaties are forbidden.

VI. The independence of the Swiss is acknowledged.

VII. 1. The Reformed [Calvinists] are to have equal rights in religion and other matters with the other states and subjects.
2. . . . but, besides the religions named [Catholic, Lutheran, Calvinist] above, no other shall be accepted or tolerated in the Holy Roman Empire.

Question:
1. What is the great importance of the Peace of Westphalia?
12.5 Putting the Poor to Work

In response to a perceived increase in the numbers of the poor, as well as to the disorder attributed to them, the Elizabethan parliament passed a series of poor laws in 1601. The laws defined central and local governmental responsibilities with respect to the poor, limited internal migration, and established poor-houses.


AN ACT FOR THE RELIEF OF THE POOR.

I. Be it enacted, That the churchwardens of every parish and four substantial householders there being subsidy men, or (for want of subsidy men) four other substantial householders of the said parish, who shall be nominated yearly in Easter week under the hand and seal of two or more justices of the peace in the same county, whereof one to be of the quorum, dwelling in or near the same parish, shall be called overseers of the poor of the same parish; and they . . . shall take order from time to time with the consent of two or more such justices of peace for setting to work of the children of all such [sic] whose parents shall not by the said persons be thought able to keep and maintain their children, and also all such persons, married or unmarried, as, having no means to maintain them, use no ordinary and daily trade of life to get their living by; and also to raise . . . by taxation of every inhabitant and every occupier of lands in the said parish . . . a convenient stock of flax, hemp, wool, thread, iron and other stuff to set the poor on work, and also competent sums of money for the necessary relief of the lame, impotent, old, blind and such other among them being poor and not able to work, and also for the putting out of such children to be apprentices . . . and to do all other things . . . concerning the premises as to them shall seem convenient:

II. And be it also enacted, That if the said justices of peace do perceive that the inhabitants of any parish are not able to levy among themselves sufficient sums of money for the purposes aforesaid, that then the said justices shall tax . . . any other of other parishes . . . within the hundred where the said parish is, to pay such sums of money . . . as the said justices shall think fit, according to the intent of this law; and if the said hundred shall not be thought to the said justices able to relieve the said several parishes . . . then the justices of peace at their general quarter sessions shall rate and assess as aforesaid any other of other parishes . . . within the said county for the purposes aforesaid as in their discretion shall seem fit.

III. And that it shall be lawful for the said churchwardens and overseers or any of them by warrant from any such two justices of peace to levy as well the said sums of money of every one that shall refuse to contribute . . . by distress and sale of the offender’s goods, as the sums of money or stock which shall be behind upon any account to be made as aforesaid . . .; and in defect of such distress it shall be lawful for any such two justices of the peace to commit him to prison, there to remain . . . till payment of the said sum or stock; and the said justices of peace or any one of them to send to the house of correction such as shall not employ themselves to work being appointed thereunto as aforesaid; and also any two such justices of peace to commit to prison every one of the said churchwardens and overseers which shall refuse to account, there to remain . . . till he have made a true account and paid so much as upon the said account shall be remaining in his hands.

IV. And be it further enacted, That it shall be lawful for the said churchwardens and overseers by the assent of any two justices of the peace to bind any such children as aforesaid to be apprentices when they shall see convenient, till such man-child shall come to the age of 24 years and such woman-child to the age of 21 years . . .

X. And be it further enacted, That . . . no person shall go wandering abroad and beg in any place whatsoever, by licence or without, upon pain to be taken and punished as a rogue: provided always that this present Act shall not extend to any poor people which shall ask relief of victuals only in the same parish where such poor people do dwell, so the same be . . . according to such order as shall be made by the churchwardens and overseers of the poor of the same parish . . .

XI. And be it further enacted, That all penalties and forfeitures before mentioned in this Act shall be employed to the use of the poor of the same parish, and towards a stock and habitation for them and other necessary uses and relief . . .

XIII. And be it also enacted, That the said justices of the peace at their general quarter sessions . . . shall set down what competent sum of money shall be sent quarterly out of every county or place corporate for the relief of the poor prisoners of the King’s Bench and Marshalsea, and also of such hospitals and almshouses as shall be in the said county . . . so as there be sent out of every county yearly 20s. at the least to the prisoners of the King’s Bench and Marshalsea;
AN ACT FOR PUNISHMENT OF ROGUES, VAGABONDS AND STURDY BEGGARS

II. Be it further enacted, That all persons calling themselves scholars going about begging, all seafaring men pretending losses [&c.] shall be deemed rogues, vagabonds and sturdy beggars, and shall sustain such punishment as by this Act in that behalf appointed.

III. And be it enacted, That every person which is by this present Act declared to be a rogue, vagabond or sturdy beggar, which shall be ... taken begging, vagrant or misordering themselves ... shall upon their apprehension ... be stripped naked from the middle upwards and shall be openly whipped until his or her body be bloody, and shall be forthwith sent from parish to parish ... the next straight way to the parish where he was born, if the same may be known ... , and if the same be not known, then to the parish where he last dwelt ... one whole year, there to put himself to labour as a true subject ought to do; or not being known where he was born or last dwelt, then to the parish through which he last passed without punishment; ... and the party so whipped and not known where he was born or last dwelt by the space of a year, shall by the officers of the said village where he so last passed through without punishment be conveyed to the house of correction ... or to the common gaol of that county or place, there to remain and be employed in work until he shall be placed in some service, and so to continue by the space of one whole year, or not being able of body, ... to remain in some almshouse in the same county or place.

IV. Provided, That if any of the said rogues shall appear to be dangerous ... or such as will not be reformed ... it shall be lawful to the said justices ... or any two of them ... to commit that rogue to the house of correction or to the gaol of that county, that there to remain until their next quarter sessions ...; and then such of the same rogues so committed, as by the justices of the peace ... shall be thought fit not to be delivered, shall ... be banished out of this realm ... and at the charge of that county shall be conveyed unto such parts beyond the seas as shall be at any time hereafter for that purpose assigned by the privy council ... or by any six or niore of them, whereof the Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal or the Lord Treasurer to be one, or be judged perpetually to the galleys of this realm, as by the same justices shall be thought fit; and if any such rogue so banished as aforesaid shall return again into any part of this realm or dominion of Wales without lawful licence ... such offence shall be felony, and the party offending therein suffer death as in case of felony ...

XIV. Provided, That every seafaring man suffering shipwreck, not having wherewith to relieve himself in his travels homewards, but having a testimonial under the hand of some one justice of the peace ... or any part of his lands [&c.]; her most excellent Majesty understanding that the said good law hath not taken such effect as was intended, by reason that no person can erect or incorporate any hospital [&c.] but her Majesty or by her Highness’ special licence ... is of her princely care ... for the relief of maimed soldiers, mariners and other poor and impotent people pleased that it be enacted ... and be it enacted, That all persons seised of an estate in fee-simple, their heirs, executors or assigns ... shall have full power, ... at any time during the space of twenty yeals next ensuing, by deed enrolled in the High Court of Chancery, to found and establish one or more hospitals, maisons de dieu, abiding-places or houses of correction ... to have continuance for ever, and from time to time to place therein such head and members and such number of poor as to him [&c.] shall seem convenient ...
AN ACT FOR THE SETTING OF THE POOR ON WORK, AND FOR THE AVOIDING OF IDLENESS

IV. . . That in every city and town corporate within this realm a competent store and stock of wool, hemp, flax, iron or other stuff by order of the mayor . . . or other head officers . . . shall be provided; and that likewise in every other market-town or other place where (to the justices of peace in their general sessions yearly next after Easter shall be thought most meet) a like competent store and stock of wool [&c.] or other stuff as the country is most meet for . . . shall be provided, the said stores and stocks in such cities and towns corporate to be committed to the custody of such persons as shall by the mayor or other head officers in every such city or town corporate be appointed, and in other towns and places to such persons as by the said justices of peace in their said general sessions . . . shall be by them appointed; which said persons . . . shall from henceforth be called the collectors and governors of the poor, to the intent every such poor and needy person . . . able to do any work . . . shall not for want of work go abroad either begging or committing pilferings or other misdemeanours . . .; which collectors from time to time (as cause requireth) shall, of the same stock and store, deliver to such poor and needy person a competent portion to be wrought into yarn or other matter . . ., for which they shall make payment to them which work the same according to the desert of the work . . .; which hemp [&c.] or other stuff, wrought from time to time, shall be sold by the said collectors . . . and with the money coming of the sale to buy more stuff . . .; and if hereafter any such person able to do any such work shall refuse to work . . . or taking such work shall spoil or embezzle the same . . . he, she or they shall be received into such house of correction, there to be straightly kept, as well in diet as in work, and also punished from time to time . . .

V. And moreover be it enacted, That within every county of this realm one, two or more abiding houses or places convenient in some market-town or corporate town or other place, by . . . order of the justices of peace in their said general sessions . . . shall be provided, and called houses of correction, and also stock and store and implements be provided for setting on work and punishing not only of those which by the collectors and governors of the poor for causes aforesaid to the said houses of correction shall be brought, but also of such as be inhabiting in no parish, or be taken as rogues . . . or for any other cause ought to be abiding and kept within the same county . . .

VI. And be it also further enacted, That the said justices of peace, in their said general sessions, shall appoint from time to time overseers of every such house of correction, which said persons shall be called the censors and wardens of the houses of correction . . .; and shall also appoint others for the gathering of such money as shall he taxed upon any persons within their several jurisdictions towards the maintenance of the said houses of correction, which shall be called the collectors for the houses of correction; and if any person refuse to be collector and governor of the poor or censor and warden or collector for any the houses of correction, that every person so refusing shall forfeit the sum of £5 . . .

Questions:
1. What concerns are expressed in the laws?
2. Who are the poor? Who is to be responsible for them?
3. What restrictions are put on them?
4. Can these concerns and responses be related in any way to present-day concerns?
12.6 The Ecclesiastical Ordinances of Geneva

John Calvin (1509–1564), influenced by both Luther’s theology and Erasmus’ humanism, experienced a sudden conversion in 1533 and became the great leader of a new generation of reformers. In 1541 his Ecclesiastical Ordinances were approved by the citizens of Geneva, allowing him to put his understanding of the church into practice. Reprinted here is part of the central section of the Ordinances.


Of the Frequency, Place and Time of Preaching

Each Sunday, at daybreak, there shall be a sermon in St. Peter’s and St. Gervaise’s, also at the customary hour at St. Peter, Magdalene and St. Gervaise. At three o’clock, as well, in all three parishes, the second sermon.

On work days, besides the two sermons mentioned, there shall be preaching three times each week, on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. These sermons shall be announced for an early hour so that they may be finished before the day’s work begins. On special days of prayer the Sunday order is to be observed.

To carry out these provisions and the other responsibilities pertaining to the ministry, five ministers and three coadjutors will be needed. The latter will also be ministers and help and reinforce the others as the occasion arises.

Concerning the Second Order, Called Teachers

The proper duty of teachers is to instruct the faithful in sound doctrine so that the purity of the gospel is not corrupted by ignorance or evil opinions. We include here the aids and instructions necessary to preserve the doctrines and to keep the church from becoming desolate for lack of pastors and ministers. To use a more familiar expression, we shall call it the order of the schools.

The order nearest to the ministry and most closely associated with the government of the church is that of lecturer in theology who teaches the Old and the New Testament. Since it is impossible to profit by such instruction without first knowing languages and the humanities, and also since it is necessary to prepare for the future in order that the church may not be neglected by the young, it will be necessary to establish a school to instruct the youth, to prepare them not only for the ministry but for government.

First of all, a proper place for teaching purposes must be designated, fit to accommodate children and others who wish to profit by such instruction; to secure someone who is both learned in subject matter and capable of looking after the building, who can also read. This person is to be employed and placed under contract on condition that he provide under his charge readers in the languages and in dialectics, if it be possible. Also to secure men with bachelor degrees to teach the children. This we hope to do to further the work of God.

These teachers shall be subject to the same ecclesiastical discipline as the ministers. There shall be no other school in the city for small children; the girls shall have their school apart, as before.

No one shall be appointed unless he is approved by the ministers, who will make their selection known to the authorities, after which he shall be presented to the council with their recommendation. In any case, when he is examined, two members of the Little Council shall be present.

The Third Order is That of Elders, Those Commissioned or Appointed to the Consistory By the Authorities

Their office is to keep watch over the lives of everyone, to admonish in love those whom they see in error and leading disorderly lives. Whenever necessary they shall make a report concerning these to the ministers who will be designated to make brotherly corrections and join with the others in making such corrections.

If the church deems it wise, it will be well to choose two from the Little Council, four from the Council of Two Hundred, honest men of good demeanor, without reproach and free from all suspicion, above all fearing God and possessed of good and spiritual judgment. It will be well to elect them from every part of the city so as to be able to maintain supervision over all. This we desire to be instituted.

This shall be the manner of their selection, inasmuch as the Little Council advises that the best men be nominated, and to call the minister so as to confer with them, after which those whom they suggest may be presented to the Council of Two Hundred for their approval. If they are found worthy, after being approved, they shall take an oath similar to that required of the ministers. At the end of the year, after the election of the council, they shall present themselves to the authorities in order that it may be decided if they are to remain in office or be replaced. It will not be expedient to replace them often without cause, or so long as they faithfully perform their duties.
The Fourth Order or the Deacons

There were two orders of deacons in the ancient church, the one concerned with receiving, distributing and guarding the goods of the poor, their possessions, income and pensions as well as the quarterly offerings; the other, to take heed to and care for the sick and administer the pittance for the poor. This custom we have preserved to the present. In order to avoid confusion, for we have both stewards and managers, one of the four stewards of the hospital is to act as receiver of all its goods and is to receive adequate remuneration in order that he may better exercise his office.

The number of four stewards shall remain as it is, of which number one shall be charged with the common funds, as directed, not only that there may be greater efficiency, but also that those who wish to make special gifts may be better assured that these will be distributed only as they desire. If the income which the officials assign is not sufficient, or if some emergency should arise, the authorities shall instruct him to make adjustments according to the need.

The election of the managers, as well as of the stewards, is to be conducted as that of the elders; in their election the rule is to be followed which was delivered by St. Paul respecting deacons.

Concerning the office and authority of stewards, we confirm the articles which have already been proposed, on condition that, in urgent matters, especially when the issue is no great matter and the expenditure involved is small, they not be required to assemble for every action taken, but that one or two of them may be permitted to act in the absence of the others, in a reasonable way.

It will be his task to take diligent care that the public hospital is well administered and that it is open not only to the sick but also to aged persons who are unable to work, to widows, orphans and other needy persons. Those who are sick are to be kept in a separate lodging, away from those who cannot work, old persons, widows, orphans and other needy persons.

Also the care of the poor who are scattered throughout the city is to be conducted as the stewards may order.

Also, that another hospital is established for the transients who should be helped. Separate provision is to be made for any who are worthy of special charity. To accomplish this, a room is to be set aside for those who shall be recommended by the stewards, and it is to be used for no other purpose.

Above all, the families of the managers are to be well managed in an efficient and godly fashion, since they are to manage the houses dedicated to God.

The ministers and the commissioners or elders, with one of the syndics, for their part, are carefully to watch for any fault or negligence of any sort, in order to beg and admonish the authorities to set it in order. Every three months they are to cause certain of their company, with the stewards, to visit the hospital to ascertain if everything is in order.

It will be necessary, also, for the benefit of the poor in the hospital and for the poor of the city who cannot help themselves, that a doctor and a competent surgeon be secured from among those who practice in the city to have the care of the hospital and to visit the poor.

The hospital, for the pestilence in any case, is to be set apart; especially should it happen that the city is visited by this rod from God.

Moreover, to prevent begging, which is contrary to good order, it will be necessary that the authorities delegate certain officers. They are to be stationed at the doors of the churches to drive away any who try to resist and, if they act impudently or answer insolently, to take them to one of the syndics. In like manner, the heads of the precincts should always watch that the law against begging is well observed.

The Persons Whom the Elders Should Admonish, and Proper Procedure in This Regard

If there shall be anyone who lays down opinions contrary to received doctrine, he is to be summoned. If he recants, he is to be dismissed without prejudice. If he is stubborn, he is to be admonished from time to time until it shall be evident that he deserves greater severity. Then, he is to be excommunicated and this action reported to the magistrate.

If anyone is negligent in attending worship so that a noticeable offense is evident for the communion of the faithful, or if anyone shows himself contemptuous of ecclesiastical discipline, he is to be admonished. If he becomes obedient, he is to be dismissed in love. If he persists, passing from bad to worse, after having been admonished three times, he is to be excommunicated and the matter reported to the authorities.

For the correction of faults, it is necessary to proceed after the ordinance of our Lord. That is, a document of ecclesiastical discipline, he is to be admonished. If he becomes obedient, he is to be dismissed in love. If he persists, passing from bad to worse, after having been admonished three times, he is to be excommunicated and the matter reported to the authorities.

For the rest, those who scorn private admonitions are to be admonished again by the church. If they will not come to reason nor recognize their error, they are to be ordered to abstain from communion until they improve.

As for obvious and public evil, which the church cannot overlook: if the faults merit nothing more than admonition, the duty of the elders shall be to summon those concerned, deal with them in love in order that they may be reformed and, if they correct the fault, to dismiss the matter. If they persevere, they are to be admonished again. If, in the end, such
procedure proves unsuccessful, they are to be denounced as contemptuous of God, and ordered to abstain from communion until it is evident that they have changed their way of life.

As for crimes that merit not only admonition but punitive correction: if any fall into such error, according to the requirements of the case, it will be necessary to command them to abstain from communion so that they humble themselves before God and repent of their error.

If anyone by being contumacious or rebellious attempts that which is forbidden, the duty of the ministers shall be to reject him, since it is not proper that he receive the sacrament.

Nevertheless, let all these measures be moderate; let there not be such a degree of rigor that anyone should be cast down, for all corrections are but medicinal, to bring back sinners to the Lord.

And let all be done in such a manner as to keep from the ministers any civil jurisdiction whatever, so that they use only the spiritual sword of the word of God as St. Paul ordered them. Thus the consistory may in no wise take from the authority of the officers or of civil justice. On the contrary, the civil power is to be kept intact. Likewise, when it shall be necessary to exercise punishment or restraint against any party, the ministers and the consistory are to hear the party concerned, deal with them and admonish them as it may seem good, reporting all to the council which, for its part, shall deliberate and then pass judgment according to the merits of the case.

Questions:
1. Besides setting up the preaching ministry, what else did these Ordinances establish?
2. What was John Calvin’s position on the separation of church and secular government?
12.7 **Mercantilism: Financing Absolutism**

Jean Baptiste Colbert (1619–83), a merchant’s son who had served as a financial secretary under Cardinal Mazarin, became Controller General of Finances shortly after Louis XIV took personal charge of the government in 1661. He inaugurated extensive fiscal reforms, but was unable to create a new tax base which could provide a stable income for the crown and a solid foundation for the French budgetary apparatus. Forced to adopt emergency policies to cope with Louis XIV’s extravagance at court and in warfare, the economy remained buried in mercantilist regulations and red tape that contributed to the French Revolution of 1789.


**DISSERTATION ON ALLIANCES, 1669**

Every nation engages in two types of trading activity: domestic trade, which is carried on within the boundaries of the nation’s home territories, and foreign trade, which, with the aid of shipping, is carried on outside the boundaries of the home territories. With respect to domestic trade, almost all nations foster it in the form of goods circulating within the country by means of internal transportation systems. With respect to foreign trade, which is a matter of capital importance, we must understand its structure if we are to have all the information we need for settling the question of alliances.

There are five principal categories of ocean-borne trading:

1. The movement of goods and wares from one port to another, or from one province to another, for consumption within the kingdom.
2. The importation from neighboring countries of goods and wares to be sold on the domestic market either as basic living commodities or as luxury items.
3. The exportation of European wares necessary to the development of the Orient and the importation from the Orient of goods necessary throughout Europe for domestic consumption or for manufacturing processes. Our trade with the Orient is the source of most of our commercial prosperity. It is conducted along two principal sea routes: the first proceeds through the Mediterranean to the Levantine ports of the Turkish Empire; the second extends across the ocean, by way of the Cape of Good Hope, to India.
4. Trade with the West Indies, of which there are two main streams. The first supplies the Spanish with the products which they need throughout the breadth of their vast empire, stretching from the straits of Magellan to the tip of California Island in the South Sea. These are delivered either to the port of Cadiz, where they are loaded into vessels and delivered to the Spanish colonies where no foreigner is allowed entry, or they are delivered directly to the West Indies, which is a difficult task. In exchange for the merchandise, the same vessels bring back silver from the West Indies and deliver it to the harbor at Cadiz where it is distributed among all the nations which have invested in the enterprise. The other stream is that which delivers similar products and wares to those islands which are held by other European nations and which bring back the sugar, tobacco and indigo that grow there.
5. Exportation to Northern Europe of all the manufactured wares and agricultural products which are processed in Middle and Southern Europe after having been imported from either the East or the West Indies, and importation from the North of all the market products which grow there: in particular, wood, hemp, ship masts, copper, iron and other shipping materials. It is an established fact that through this exchange, Northern Europe makes all the other exchanges possible, which makes it the most important of all the trade regions.

These different types of trade have always existed in Europe, but when they have been carried out by a single nation, demand has fallen and prices have risen. Thus, trade relations have always drawn more money away from the other parties and have always prospered those who initiate them. Trade with the Near East, which used to include trade with the Far East until the Portuguese sailed around the Cape of Good Hope, was long in the hands of the Venetians. The French and the English enjoyed but a minimal portion of that trade. Subsequently, through exploration and military victories on the coast of Africa, through their business ventures and military successes throughout Asia, not excluding China, the Portuguese have won the biggest part of this trade away from the Venetians and have increased the supply of imported goods. Consequently, consumption is greater and prices have been reduced. Following the example of the Portuguese, the Spaniards have discovered the West Indies which have such an abundance of wealth that there is room for all investors to profit from it.
During the period when these nations dominated foreign trade in the South, the French and the English had a small share of the trade in the North. But for the French this share supplied only an insignificant fraction of their material needs. As for the English, this share provided them with virtually all their needs and in addition met part of the needs of the other northern nations, for the English have always had good trade relations with the North. At first, Bruges was the principal exchange mart for this trading activity. Then the inhabitants of Antwerp took advantage of their port, facilities and attracted trade there. After the wars between the Spanish and the Dutch, the self-discipline, the moderation and the zeal of the Dutch attracted world trade to Amsterdam and to the other cities of Holland. But they were not satisfied with being the central exchange mart for all Europe and especially for the North. They decided to gain control of foreign trade at its very source. To this end they ruined the Portuguese in the East Indies. They inhibited or disturbed in every possible way the business ventures which the English had established there. They employed and are still employing every means, are exerting every effort, are applying their full resources to assume full control of world trade and to keep it out of the hands of all other nations. Their whole government is based upon this single principle. They know that as long as they maintain their commercial superiority, their power on both land and sea will keep on increasing and will make them so powerful that they will become the arbiters of peace and war in Europe. They can set whatever limits they please upon the law and the design of kings.

As to whether they have the will power and the physical power to become the masters of all trade, there is no doubt at all in the first respect. With regard to their physical power, if we consider their powers in the Near East, in the East Indies, in the neighboring kingdoms and in the North, we can only conclude that they currently occupy first position and need only to maintain that status. In proof of my point, we have been keeping a check on their sea vessels for 4 or 5 years, and we estimate that they possess the incredible number of 15,000 to 16,000.

On the basis of this information, and after a very careful analysis, we can assert definitively that European trade is supported by some 20,000 vessels of all sizes. It is easy to see that this number cannot be increased, inasmuch as the population remains constant in all the nations and that consumer activity remains constant. Of this total of 20,000 ships, the Dutch have 15,000 to 16,000, the English 3,000 to 4,000 and the French 500 to 600.

This, then, has been and remains at present the state of European trade. But before proceeding further, we must note that the naval power of a nation plays an important role in the development of its trading program. In a sense, naval power follows on the heels of trading power because of the vast numbers of sailors and seamen involved, the experience which the captains and other officers accumulate, and the enormous number of ships to which it gives rise. But there is this difference. However superior the Dutch may be to the English in the total number of ships and seamen, they can never excel the English in naval power. The English may have lesser numbers, but they are superior in their experience and their knowledge of sea war and they infinitely excel the Dutch in genuine courage.

As for the French, their naval power and its use are still in the nascent stage. Certainly, therefore, it would be folly for France to try to attain in a few years a power to which the two other nations attained in the one case a century ago and in the other case several centuries ago. One need only consider the limited number of vessels in her merchant fleet to perceive clearly that she can give support to her naval strength only in proportion to that number. This issues from the general axiom that merchant shipping contributes to the strength and substance of all sea power and that no nation can have sea power without having shipping.

With all these factors clearly in mind, we must now return to our original consideration: in the alliance under examination, England is seeking principally to strengthen its trade. This strengthening process can be effected only if England uses more of the vessels belonging to her private citizens and if she increases their number. Such an increase can occur only if England discovers some hitherto unknown trading arenas or by reducing the number of vessels of one of the other nations.

The discovery of a new trading arena is highly unlikely. There is no point even in considering such a tenuous possibility. To be quite frank, such a circumstance could not possibly develop. Even if it should develop, it would not produce a new consumers’ market for the products necessary to life and creature comforts. Rather it would offer to one nation and deny to another the means of drawing on those already in use and belonging to a pattern of international consumption that is common to all Europe.

It must be, then, through the reduction in number of the ships of one of the other nations. But that other nation cannot be the French, because there is nothing to be gained from them. In all their ports, both on the Atlantic and on the Mediterranean, they have only 500 or 600 ships which carry a small portion of their wares and goods from port to port, without any trade in the North or elsewhere. We are obliged to conclude, therefore, that England cannot use any more of her subjects’ vessels nor can she increase the number without reducing the number of Dutch vessels. Consequently, it is difficult to establish a close alliance when its principal aim would be to increase one’s power at the expense of the ally.
The political philosophies of great rulers have always taught that it is not to a weak ruler’s advantage to ally himself willingly with a ruler more powerful than he, lest that superior power overwhelm and destroy him. That has happened on numerous occasions. The same political philosophies insist that the weak ruler always work to maintain a balance of power by allying himself to the nearest force in order to hold in check the growth of a third nation.

Applying the same philosophy to the present instance, we see that the Dutch have the most powerful trading system which exists or which has ever existed in the world. The English have a less flourishing system and the French the least flourishing of all. Therefore, reason declares that neither of these two nations may ally itself to the Dutch, for fear that, in the attempt to strengthen their trading power, they would be overwhelmed and completely destroyed. The same reasoning insists that the two nations pool their interests and apply their full might to undertaking a secret war against Dutch trade. They would profit from all the advantages that their location and their power give them to cut the Dutch off from what rightfully belongs to them. We shall outline hereafter several means for accomplishing this.

We should add that trade problems give rise to a continuing battle both in peace and in war among the nations of Europe to see who will win the upper hand. The Dutch, the English and the French are the contestants in this match. Through their zeal the Dutch have amassed sufficient power to fight with 16,000 ships. The English bring 3,000 to 4,000 vessels to the fray, the French bring 500 to 600. It is easy to see who will be victorious. And if the 3,000 to 4,000 align themselves with the 16,000, it is child’s play to predict that the 16,000 can lose nothing and that the 3,000 to 4,000 run the risk of keeping on losing and even of being totally destroyed. We should add to these arguments the fact that, in spite of the superior numbers of ships which the Dutch possess in their trade war with the English, the Dutch are a thriftier, more economical people than the English. The former are more industrious, more profit-conscious than the latter. Their government draws its primary financial strength from its trade relations. Since both of these governments shape all their policies in terms of this commercial structure, the English cannot fail to come out second best in such an alliance. These reasons are, of course, quite persuasive in themselves, but there are yet others which must be considered.

It is generally agreed that the English have always demonstrated an instinctive aversion for the French. It is further agreed that this aversion was intensified by the recent war with all its attendant misfortunes. Despite this aversion, however, these kingdoms and their monarchs have remained at complete peace with each other for more than 100 years. This peace was interrupted by the war of La Rochelle which lasted but a few months and once again, subsequently, by the Dutch war. In view of this lengthy period of harmony one may conclude that the two nations can without difficulty live in a mutually comfortable relationship.

It is possible that the citizens of London show a greater hostility to the French now than in the past. But we can assume with a considerable certainty of being right that this hostility is fanned by Spanish and Dutch sympathizers who are in turn abetted by those who favored the recent disorders because they did not want to see the legitimate English government strengthened by such a powerful alliance as one with France. But we may rest assured that this distemper will cool. England has the means to prevent its persisting. What is more, when the alliance is made, the citizens will begin to enjoy its fruits. Thus, the close understanding which has always joined the two nations will be reaffirmed. This is particularly true because in joining forces, the two nations will enjoy real and substantial benefits in the exercise of their trading activities.

We must readily allow that psychologically and temperamentally the English are more akin to the Dutch than to the French. But it is plain to see that if they relish peace and tranquility and if they would not betray their political interests, they can draw no real advantages from an alliance with a people who are ruled by a government of merchants, whose political principles and power function only as an adjunct to their trade relations. Their prosperity will all too easily make the English see what differences separate a republic and a monarchy with respect to their commercial interests, which are the only interests to hold the attention of said republicans. But the alliance and union with the French produces an entirely different effect.

As for any jealousy which the English might feel over French naval power, it could not be a logical jealousy. Control of the earth’s land masses lies in the hands of the rulers of those states which are abundantly populated by a naturally courageous and warrior-like people. Control of the seas, however, does not depend on population counts. Control of the sea goes to those who have enjoyed a long and intimate association with the sea. It goes to that nation whose maritime trade relations are elaborate enough to provide a sufficiently large reservoir of sailors from whose numbers a sea force may be formed. It is an established fact that the size of a nation’s navy is proportional to that of its merchant marine. But if we are absolutely bound to attribute any jealousy to the English, it would be more logical to suspect that they feel it with respect to the Dutch. Only the Dutch presume to equal England’s power in the recent war. Indeed, in view of their continually expanding trade relations, their sea power cannot fail to increase proportionally. As for the mutual aid which nations can bring to each other in their trade relations, the English will destroy themselves if they ally with the Dutch. Everything we have said points to it. An infinite number of examples prove it.
Now that we have given careful consideration to our main point—the advantages to be reaped by the peoples of the two nations—let us consider the interests and the reputations of the rulers of the two nations.

In this connection, there are endless reasons why an alliance with France should be preferable to an alliance with Holland: the blood kinship of the two monarchs; the similarity of their intellects and their personalities; the geographical location of their domains; the similarity of their type of government; the striking dissimilarities of the English monarchy and the Dutch republic; the domestic tranquility which they can bring to their respective nations by a union of interests; their willingness to consider candidly all the advantages and glories which will accrue to them.

To realize this great dream: [1] the monarchs need only join in a close alliance which no subject or no occasion can trouble or interrupt; [2] they need only establish a policy of equal and reciprocal relations between the two nations throughout the breadth of their kingdoms; [3] to this end they need only establish two advisory councils in the two capital cities which will act in common accord, cooperating in every way possible to enhance the quality and extend the scope of the trade relations of the two nations.... It would profit the two kingdoms enormously.

Questions:
1. What European nation most impressed Colbert and why?
2. By what steps did he propose that France win commercial supremacy?
3. How does this treatise illustrate Colbert’s mercantilist policies?
13.1 Francis Bacon: from First Book of Aphorisms

The English philosopher Francis Bacon (1561–1626) lived an active and varied life. In his time, he was a leading statesman, philosopher, scholar, and scientist. He died in 1626 as the result of an illness he contracted while carrying out an experiment on the use of cold to preserve chicken.


III

Human knowledge and human power meet in one; for where the cause is not known the effect cannot be produced. Nature to be commanded must be obeyed; and that which in contemplation is as the cause is in operation as the rule.

IV

Towards the effecting of works, all that man can do is to put together or put asunder natural bodies. The rest is done by nature working within.

VII

The productions of the mind and hand seem very numerous in books and manufactures. But all this variety lies in an exquisite subtlety and derivations from a few things already known; not in the number of axioms.

VIII

Moreover the works already known are due to chance and experiment rather than to science; for the sciences we now possess are merely systems for the nice ordering and setting forth of things already invented; not methods of invention or directions for new works.

XI

As the sciences which we now have do not help us in finding out new works, so neither does the logic which we now have help us in finding out new sciences.

XII

The logic now in use serves rather to fix and give stability to the errors which have their foundation in commonly received notions than to help the search after truth. So it does more harm than good.

XIV

The syllogism consists of propositions, propositions consists of words, words are symbols of notions. Therefore if the notions themselves (which is the root of the matter) are confused and over-hastily abstracted from the facts, there can be no firmness in the superstructure. Our only hope therefore lies in a true induction.

XIX

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 last of all. This is the true way, but as yet untried.
XXII
Both ways set out from the senses and particulars, and rest in the highest generalities; but the difference between them is infinite. For the one just glances at experiment and particulars in passing, the other dwells duly and orderly among them. The one, again, begins at once by establishing certain abstract and useless generalities, the other rises by gradual steps to that which is prior and better known in the order of nature.

XXIV
It cannot be that axioms established by argumentation should avail for the discovery of new works; since the subtlety of nature is greater many times over than the subtlety of argument. But axioms duly and orderly formed from particulars easily discover the way to new particulars, and thus render sciences active.

XXV
The axioms now in use, having been suggested by a scanty and manipular experience and a few particulars of most general occurrence, are made for the most part just large enough to fit and take these in: and therefore it is no wonder if they do not lead to new particulars. And if some opposite instance, not observed or not known before, chance to come in the way, the axiom is rescued and preserved by some frivolous distinction; whereas the truer course would be to correct the axiom itself.

XXXI
It is idle to expect any great advancement in science from the superinducing and engraving of new things upon old. We must begin anew from the very foundations, unless we would revolve for ever in a circle with mean and contemptible progress.

XXXVI
One method of delivery alone remains to us; which is simply this: We must lead men to the particulars themselves, and their series and order; while men on their side must force themselves for awhile to lay their notions by and begin to familiarise themselves with facts.

XLVI
The human understanding when it has once adopted an opinion (either as being the received opinion or as being agreeable to itself) draws all things else to support and agree with it. And though there be a greater number and weight of instances to be found on the other side, yet these it either neglects and despises, or else by some distinction sets aside and rejects; in order that by this great and pernicious predetermination the authority of its former conclusions may remain inviolate. And therefore it was a good answer that was made by one who when they showed him hanging in a temple a picture of those who had paid their vows as having escaped shipwreck, and would have him say whether he did not now acknowledge the power of the gods,—”Aye,” asked he again, “but where are they painted that were drowned, after their vows?” And such is the way of all superstition, whether in astrology, dreams, omens, divine judgments, or the like; wherein men, having a delight in such vanities, mark the events where they are fulfilled, but where they fail, though this happen much oftener, neglect and pass them by. But with far more subtlety does this mischief insinuate itself into philosophy and the sciences; in which the first conclusion colours and brings into conformity with itself all that come after, though far sounder and better. Besides, independently of that delight and vanity which I have described, it is the peculiar and perpetual error of human intellect to be more moved and excited by affirmatives than by negatives; whereas it ought properly to hold itself indifferently disposed towards both alike. Indeed in the establishment of any true axiom, the negative instance is the more forcible of the two.

C
But not only is a greater abundance of experiments to be sought for and procured, and that too of a different kind from those hitherto tried; an entirely different method, order, and process for carrying on and advancing experience must also be introduced. For experience, when it wanders in its own track, is, as I have already remarked, mere groping in the dark, and confounds men rather than instructs them. But when it shall proceed in accordance with a fixed law, in regular order, and without interruption, then may better things be hoped of knowledge.
The understanding must not however be allowed to jump and fly from particulars to remote axioms and of almost the highest generality (such as the first principles, as they are called, of arts and things), and taking stand upon them as truths that cannot be shaken, proceed to prove and frame the middle axioms by reference to them; which has been the practice hitherto; the understanding being not only carried that way by a natural impulse, but also by the use of syllogistic demonstration trained and inured to it. But then, and then only, may we hope well of the sciences, when in a just scale of ascent, and by successive steps not interrupted or broken, we rise from particulars to lesser axioms; and then to middle axioms, one above the other; and last of all to the most general. For the lowest axioms differ but slightly from bare experience, while the highest and most general (which we now have) are notional and abstract and without solidity. But the middle are the true and solid and living axioms, on which depend the affairs and fortunes of men; and above them again, last of all, those which are indeed the most general; such I mean as are not abstract, but of which those intermediate axioms are really limitations.

The understanding must not therefore be supplied with wings, but rather hung with weights, to keep it from leaping and flying. Now this has never been done; when it is done, we may entertain better hopes of the sciences.

In establishing axioms, another form of induction must be devised than has hitherto been employed; and it must be used for proving and discovering not first principles (as they are called) only, but also the lesser axioms, and the middle, and indeed all. For the induction which proceeds by simple enumeration is childish; its conclusions are precarious, and exposed to peril from a contradictory instance; and it generally decides on too small a number of facts, and on those only which are at hand. But the induction which is to be available for the discovery and demonstration of sciences and arts, must analyse nature by proper rejections and exclusions; and then, after a sufficient number of negatives, come to a conclusion on the affirmative instances; which has not yet been done or even attempted, save only by Plato, who does indeed employ this form of induction to a certain extent for the purpose of discussing definitions and ideas. But in order to furnish this induction or demonstration well and duly for its work, very many things are to be provided which no mortal has yet thought of: insomuch that greater labour will have to be spent in it than has hitherto been spent on the syllogism. And this induction must be used not only to discover axioms, but also in the formation of notions. And it is in this induction that our chief hope lies.

But in establishing axioms by this kind of induction, we must also examine and try whether the axiom so established be framed to the measure of those particulars only from which it is derived, or whether it be larger and wider. And if it be larger and wider, we must observe whether by indicating to us new particulars it confirm that wideness and largeness as by a collateral security; that we may not either stick fast in things already known, or loosely grasp at shadows and abstract forms; not at things solid and realised in matter. And when the process shall have come into use, then at last shall we see the dawn of a solid hope.

The following is Aphorism X from the Second Book of Aphorisms.

[Now my directions for the interpretation of nature embrace two generic divisions; the one how to educe and form axioms from experience; the other how to deduce and derive new experiments from axioms. The former again is divided into three ministrations; a ministration to the sense, a mainstration to the memory, and a ministration to the mind or reason. For first of all we must prepare a Natural and Experimental History, sufficient and good; and this is the foundation of all; for we are not to imagine or suppose, but to discover, what nature does or may be made to do. But natural and experimental history is so various and diffuse, that it confounds and distracts the understanding, unless it be ranged and Presented to view in a suitable order. We must therefore form Tables and Arrangements of Instances, in such a method and order that the understanding may be able to deal with them. And even when this is done, still the understanding, if left to itself and its own spontaneous movements, is incompetent and unfit to form axioms, unless it be directed and guarded. Therefore in the third place we must use Induction, true and legitimate induction, which is the very key of interpretation.]
13.2 Miguel de Cervantes: Chapter I from Don Quixote

Miguel Cervantes (1547–1616) is often credited with authoring the first European novel. Don Quixote (1605), Cervantes’ satire of chivalric ideals, was a huge success and established his reputation as a writer. In the selection included here, Cervantes sketches the circumstances and character of his hero, Don Quixote de la Mancha.


In a certain village in La Mancha, which I do not wish to name, there lived not long ago a gentleman—one of those who have always a lance in the rack, an ancient shield, a lean hack and a grey-hound for coursing. His habitual diet consisted of a stew, more beef than mutton, of hash most nights, boiled bones on Saturdays, lentils on Fridays, and a young pigeon as a Sunday treat; and on this he spent three-quarters of his income. The rest of it went on a fine cloth doublet, velvet breeches and slippers for holidays, and a homespun suit of the best in which he decked himself on weekdays. His household consisted of a housekeeper of rather more than forty, a niece not yet twenty, and a lad for the field and market, who saddled his horse and wielded the pruning-hook.

Our gentleman was verging on fifty, of tough constitution, lean-bodied, thin-faced, a great early riser and a lover of hunting. They say that his surname was Quixada or Quesada—for there is some difference of opinion amongst authors on this point. However, by very reasonable conjecture we may take it that he was called Quezana. But this does not much concern our story; enough that we do not depart by so much as an inch from the truth in the telling of it.

The reader must know, then, that this gentleman, in the times when he had nothing to do—as was the case for most of the year—gave himself up to the reading of books of knight errantry; which he loved and enjoyed so much that he almost entirely forgot his hunting, and even the care of his estate. So odd and foolish, indeed, did he grow on this subject that he sold many acres of cornland to buy these books of chivalry to read, and in this way brought home every one he could get. And of them all he considered none so good as the works of the famous Feliciano de Silva. For his brilliant style and those complicated sentences seemed to him very pearls, especially when he came upon those love-passages and challenges frequently written in the manner of: ‘The reason for the unreason with which you treat my reason, so weakens my reason that with reason I complain of your beauty’; and also when he read: ‘The high heavens that with their stars divinely fortify you in your divinity and make you deserving of the desert that your greatness deserves.’

These writings drove the poor knight out of his wits; and he passed sleepless nights trying to understand them and disentangle their meaning, though Aristotle himself would never have unravelled or understood them, even if he had been resurrected for that sole purpose. He did not much like the wounds that Sir Belianis gave and received, for he imagined that his face and his whole body must have been covered with scars and marks, however skilful the surgeons who tended him. But, for all that, he admired the author for ending his book with the promise to continue with that interminable adventure, and often the desire seized him to take up the pen himself, and write the promised sequel for him No doubt he would have done so, and perhaps successfully, if other greater and more persistent preoccupations had not prevented him.

Often he had arguments with the priest of his village, who was a scholar and a graduate of Siguenza, as to which was the better knight—Paimerin of England or Amadis of Gaul. But Master Nicholas, the barber of that village, said that no one could compare with the Knight of the Sun. Though if anyone could, it was Sir Galaor, brother of Amadis of Gaul. For he had a very accommodating nature, and was not so affected nor such a sniveller as his brother, though he was not a bit behind him in the matter of bravery.

In short, he so buried himself in his books that he spent the nights reading from twilight till daybreak and the days from dawn till dark; and so from little sleep and much reading, his brain dried up and he lost his wits. He filled his mind with all that he read in them, with enchantments, quarrels, battles, challenges, wounds, wooings, loves, torments and other impossible nonsense; and so deeply did he steep his imagination in the belief that all the fanciful stuff he read was true, that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft that to his mind no history in the world was more authentic. He used to say that the Cid Ruy Diaz must have been a very good knight, but that he could not be compared to the Knight of the Burning Sword, who with a single backstroke had cleft
In fact, now that he had utterly wrecked his reason he fell into the strangest fancy that ever a madman had in the whole world. He thought it fit and proper, both in order to increase his renown and to serve the state, to turn knight errant and travel through the world with horse and armour in search of adventures, following in every way the practice of the knights errant he had read of, redressing all manner of wrongs, and exposing himself to chances and dangers, by the overcoming of which he might win eternal honour and renown. Already the poor man fancied himself crowned by the valour of his arm, at least with the empire of Trebizond; and so, carried away by the strange pleasure he derived from these agreeable thoughts, he hastened to translate his desires into action.

The first thing that he did was to clean some armour which had belonged to his ancestors, and had lain for ages forgotten in a corner, eaten with rust and covered with mould. But when he had cleaned and repaired it as best he could, he found that there was one great defect: the helmet was a simple head-piece without a visor. So he ingeniously made good this deficiency by fashioning out of pieces of pasteboard a kind of half-visor which, fitted to the helmet, gave the appearance of a complete headpiece. However, to see if it was strong enough to stand up to the risk of a sword-cut, he took out his sword and gave it two strokes, the first of which demolished in a moment what had taken him a week to make. He was not too pleased at the ease with which he had destroyed it, and to safeguard himself against this danger, reconstructed the visor, putting some strips of iron inside, in such a way as to satisfy himself of his protection; and, not caring to make another trial of it, he accepted it as a fine jointed headpiece and put it into commission.

Next he went to inspect his hack, but though, through leanness, he had more quarters than there are pence in a groat, and more blemishes than Gonelia’s horse, which was nothing but skin and bone, he appeared to our knight more than the equal of Alexander’s Bucephalus and the Cid’s Babieca. He spent four days pondering what name to give him; for, he reflected, it would be wrong for the horse of so famous a knight, a horse so good in himself, to be without a famous name. Therefore he tried to fit him with one that would signify what he had been before his master turned knight errant, and what he now was; for it was only right that as his master changed his profession, the horse should change his name for a sublime and high-sounding one, befitting the new order and the new calling he professed. So, after many names invented, struck out and rejected, amended, cancelled and remade in his fanciful mind, he finally decided to call him Rocinante, a name which seemed to him grand and sonorous, and to express the common horse he had been before arriving at his present state: the first and foremost of all hacks in the world.

Having found so pleasing a name for his horse, he next decided to do the same for himself, and spent another eight days thinking about it. Finally he resolved to call himself Don Quixote. And that is no doubt why the authors of this true history, as we have said, assumed that his name must have been Quixada and not Quesada, as other authorities would have it. Yet he remembered that the valorous Amadis had not been content with his bare name, but had added the name of his kingdom and native country in order to make it famous, and styled himself Amadis of Gaul. So, like a good knight, he decided to add the name of his country to his own and call himself Don Quixote de la Mancha. Thus, he thought, he very clearly proclaimed his parentage and native land and honoured it by taking his surname from it.

Now that his armour was clean, his helmet made into a complete head-piece, a name found for his horse, and he confirmed in his new title, it struck him that there was only one more thing to do: to find a lady to be enamoured of. For a knight errant without a lady is like a tree without a groat, and more blemishes than Gonelia’s horse, which was nothing but skin and bone, he appeared to our knight more than the equal of Alexander’s Bucephalus and the Cid’s Babieca. He spent four days pondering what name to give him; for, he reflected, it would be wrong for the horse of so famous a knight, a horse so good in himself, to be without a famous name. Therefore he tried to fit him with one that would signify what he had been before his master turned knight errant, and what he now was; for it was only right that as his master changed his profession, the horse should change his name for a sublime and high-sounding one, befitting the new order and the new calling he professed. So, after many names invented, struck out and rejected, amended, cancelled and remade in his fanciful mind, he finally decided to call him Rocinante, a name which seemed to him grand and sonorous, and to express the common horse he had been before arriving at his present state: the first and foremost of all hacks in the world.

Having found so pleasing a name for his horse, he next decided to do the same for himself, and spent another eight days thinking about it. Finally he resolved to call himself Don Quixote. And that is no doubt why the authors of this true history, as we have said, assumed that his name must have been Quixada and not Quesada, as other authorities would have it. Yet he remembered that the valorous Amadis had not been content with his bare name, but had added the name of his kingdom and native country in order to make it famous, and styled himself Amadis of Gaul. So, like a good knight, he decided to add the name of his country to his own and call himself Don Quixote de la Mancha. Thus, he thought, he very clearly proclaimed his parentage and native land and honoured it by taking his surname from it.

Now that his armour was clean, his helmet made into a complete head-piece, a name found for his horse, and he confirmed in his new title, it struck him that there was only one more thing to do: to find a lady to be enamoured of. For a knight errant without a lady is like a tree without leaves or fruit and a body without a soul. He said to himself again and again: If I for my sins or by good luck were to meet with some giant hereabouts, as generally happens to knights errant, and if I were to overthrow him in the encounter, or cut him down the middle or, in short, conquer him and make him surrender, would it not be well to have someone to whom I could send him as a present, so that he could enter and kneel down before my sweet lady and say in tones of humble submission: “Lady, I am the giant Caracutiambro, lord of the island of Malindrania, whom the never-sufficiently-to-be-praised knight, Don Quixote de la Mancha, conquered in single combat and ordered to appear before your Grace, so that your Highness might dispose of me according to your will”?” Oh, how pleased our knight was when he had made up this speech, and even gladder when he found someone whom he could call his lady. It happened, it is believed, in this way: in a village near his there was a very good-looking farm girl, whom he had been taken with at one time, although she is supposed not to have known it or had proof of it. Her name was Aidonza Lorenzo, and she it was he thought fit to call the lady of his fancies; and, casting around for a name which should not be too far away from her own, yet suggest and imply a princess and great lady, he resolved to call her Dulcinea del Toboso—for she was a native of El Toboso—a name which seemed to him as musical, strange and significant as those others that he had devised for himself and his possessions.

Question:
1. What does the author think of his hero?
13.3 John Bunyan: from Pilgrim’s Progress

A tinker throughout most of his life, John Bunyan (1628–1688) preached and published his understanding of Christianity in vivid, accessible English. In and out of trouble with the government, Bunyan wrote much of his body of work while in prison. In this excerpt from Pilgrim’s Progress, Bunyan explained his reason for publishing and defended his approach to writing.


THE AUTHOR’S APOLOGY FOR HIS BOOK

When at the first I took my pen in hand,
Thus for to write, I did not understand
That I at all should make a little book
In such a mode; nay, I had undertook
To make another, which when almost done,
Before I was aware, I this begun.

And thus it was: I writing of the way
And race of saints in this our Gospel-day,
Fell suddenly into an allegory
About their journey, and the way to glory,
In more than twenty things, which I set down;
This done, I twenty more had in my crown,
And they again began to multiply, Like sparks that from
the coals of fire do fly.
Nay then, thought I, if that you breed so fast,
I’ll put you by yourselves, lest you at last
Should prove ad infinitum, and eat out
The book that I already am about.

Well, so I did; but yet I did not think
To show to all the world my pen and ink
In such a mode; I only thought to make
I knew not what, nor did I undertake
Thereby to please my neighbour; no, not I,
I did it mine own self to gratify.
Neither did I but vacant seasons spend
in this my scribble, nor did I intend

But to divert myself in doing this,
From worser thoughts which make me do amiss.

Thus I set pen to paper with delight,
And quickly had my thoughts in black and white.
For having now my method by the end,
Still as I pulled it came, and so I penned
It down, until it came at last to be
For length and breadth the bigness which you see.
Well, when I had thus put mine ends together,  
I show’d them others that I might see whether  
They would condemn them, or them justify:  
And some said, ‘let them live’; some, ‘let them die’:  
Some said, ‘John, print it’; others said, ‘not so’:  
Some said, ‘It might do good’; others said, ‘no’.  

Now was I in a strait, and did not see  
Which was the best thing to be done by me:  
At last I thought, since you are thus divided,  
I print it will, and so the case decided.  

For, thought I, some I see would have it done,  
Though others in that channel do not run.  
To prove then who advised for the best,  
Thus I thought fit to put it to the test.  

I further thought, if now I did deny  
Those that would have it thus, to gratify,  
I did not know, but hinder them I might,  
Of that which would to them be great delight.  

For those that were not for its coming forth,  
I said to them, offend you I am loth;  
Yet since your brethren pleased with it be,  
Forbear to judge, to you do further see.  

If that thou wilt not read, let it alone;  
Some love the meat, some love to pick the bone:  
Yea, that I might them better palliate,  
I did too with them thus expostulate.  

May I not write in such a style as this?  
In such a method too, and yet not miss  
Mine end, thy good? why may it not be done?  
Dark clouds bring waters, when the bright bring none;  
Yea, dark, or bright, if they their silver drops  
Cause to descend, the earth by yielding crops  
Gives praise to both, and carpeth not at either,  
But treasures up the fruit they yield together:  
Yea, so commixes both, that in her fruit  
None can distinguish this from that, they suit  
Her well when hungry, but if she be full  
She spews out both, and makes their blessings null.  

You see the ways the fisherman doth take  
To catch the fish, what engines doth he make?  

Behold! how he engageth all his wits  
Also his snares, lines, angles, hooks and nets.  
Yet fish there be, that neither hook, nor line,  
Nor snare, nor net, nor engine can make thine;  
They must be groped for, and be tickled too,  
Or they will not be catched, what e’er you do.
How doth the fowler seek to catch his game?
By divers means, all which one cannot name.
His gun, his nets, his lime-twigs, fight and bell:
He creeps, he goes, he stands; yea, who can tell
Of all his postures? Yet there’s none of these
Will make him master of what fowls he please.
Yea, he must pipe, and whistle to catch this,
Yet if he does so, that bird he will miss.

If that a pearl may in a toad’s head dwell,
And may be found too in an oyster-shell;
If things that promise nothing, do contain
What better is than gold, who will disdain
(That have an inkling of it) there to look,
That they may find it? Now my little book
(Though void of all those paintings that may make
It with this or the other man to take)
Is not without those things that do excel,
What do in brave but empty notions dwell.

‘Well, yet I am not fully satisfied,
That this your book will stand, when soundly tried.

Why, what’s the matter? ‘It is dark’, What tho’?
‘But it is feigned’, What of that I trow?
Some men by feigning words as dark as mine,
Make truth to spangle, and its ray to shine.

‘But they want solidness.’ Speak man thy mind.
‘They drowned the weak; metaphors make us blind.’
Solidity, indeed becomes the pen
Of him that writeth things divine to men:
But must I needs want solidness, because
By metaphors I speak; was not God’s laws,
His Gospel-laws in olden time held forth
By types, shadows and metaphors? Yet loth
Will any sober man be to find fault
With them, lest he be found for to assault
The highest wisdom. No, he rather stoops,
And seeks to find out what by pins and loops,
By calves, and sheep, by heifers, and by rams,
By birds and herbs, and by the blood of lambs
God speaketh to him: and happy is he
That finds the light, and grace that in them be.

Be not too forward therefore to conclude
That I want solidness, that I am rude:
All things solid in show not solid be;
All things in parables despise not we
Lest things most hurtful lightly we receive;
And things that good are, of our souls bereave.

My dark and cloudy words they do but hold
The truth, as cabinets enclose the gold.
The prophets used much by metaphors
To set forth truth; yea, who so considers
Christ, his Apostles too, shall plainly see,
That truths to this day in such mantles be.

Am I afraid to say that Holy Writ,
Which for its style and phrase puts down all wit,
Is everywhere so full of all these things,
(Dark figures, allegories), yet there springs
From that same book that lustre and those rays
Of light that turns our darkest nights to days.

Come, let my carper to his life now look,
And find there darker lines than in my book
He findeth any. Yea, and let him know
That in his best things there are worse lines too.

May we but stand before impartial men,
To his poor one, I durst adventure ten
That they will take my meaning in these lines
Far better than his lies in silver shrines.
Come, truth, although in swaddling-clouts, I find
Informs the judgement, rectifies the mind,
Pleases the understanding, makes the will
Submit; the memory too it doth fill
With what doth our imagination please,
Likewise, it tends our troubles to appease.

Sound words I know Timothy is to use,
And old wives’ fables he is to refuse,
But yet grave Paul him nowhere doth forbid
The use of parables; in which lay hid
That gold, those pearls, and precious stones that were
Worth digging for, and that with greatest care.

Let me add one word more, O man of God!
Art thou offended? Dost thou wish I had
Put forth my matter in another dress,
Or that I had in things been more express?
Three things let me propound, then I submit
To those that are my betters (as is fit).

1. I find not that I am denied the use
Of this my method, so I no abuse
Put on the words, things, readers, or be rude
In handling figure, or similitude,
In application; but all that I may
Seek the advance of Truth this or that way.
Denied did I say? Nay, I have leave
(Example too, and that from them that have

God better please by their words or ways
Than any man that breatheth nowadays),
Thus to express my mind, thus to declare
Things unto thee that excellentest are.
2. I find that men (as high as trees) will write Dialogue-wise, yet no man doth them slight
   For writing so: indeed if they abuse
   Truth, cursed be they, and the craft they use
   To that intent; but yet let truth be free
   To make her sallies upon thee, and me,
   Which way it pleases God. For who knows how,
   Better than he that taught us first to plough,
   To guide our mind and pens for his design?
   And he makes base things usher in divine.

3. I find that Holy Writ in many places
   Hath semblance with this method, where the cases
   Doth call for one thing to set forth another:
   Use it I may then, and yet nothing smother
   Truth’s golden beams, nay, by this method may
   Make it cast forth its rays as light as day.

And now, before I do put up my pen,
I’ll show the profit of my book, and then
Commit both thee, and it unto that hand
That pulls the strong down, and makes weak ones stand.

This book it chalketh out before thine eyes
   The man that seeks the everlasting prize:
   It shows you whence he comes, whither he goes,
   What he leaves undone, also what he does:
   It also shows you how he runs, and runs,
   Till he unto the Gate of Glory comes.

It shows too who sets out for life amain,
   As if the lasting crown they would attain:
   Here also you may see the reason why
   They lose their labour, and like fools do die.

This book will make a traveller of thee,
   If by its counsel thou wilt ruled be;
   It will direct thee to die Holy Land,
   If thou wilt its directions understand:
   Yea, it will make the slothful active be,
   The blind also delightful things to see.

Art thou for something rare, and profitable?
   Would’st thou see a truth within a fable?
   Art thou forgetful? Wouldest thou remember
   From New Year’s Day to the last of December?
   Then read my fancies, they will stick like burrs,
   And may be to the helpless, comforters.

This book is writ in such a dialect
   As may the minds of listless men affect:

It seems a novelty, and yet contains
   Nothing but sound and honest gospel-strains.
Would’st thou divert thyself from melancholy?
Would’st thou be pleasant, yet be far from folly?
Would’st thou read riddles and their explanation,
Or else be drown’d in thy contemplation?
Dost thou love picking-meat? Or would’st thou see
A man i’ the clouds, and hear him speak to thee?
Would’st thou be in a dream, and yet not sleep?
Or would’st thou in a moment laugh and weep?
Wouldest thou lose thyself, and catch no harm
And find thyself again without a charm?
Would’st read thyself, and read thou know’st not what
And yet know whether thou art blest or not,
By reading the same lines? O then come hither,
And lay may book, thy head and heart together.

JOHN BUNYAN

Question:
1. What does the author see as his purpose for the book?
13.4 Thomas Hobbes: Chapter XIII from *Leviathan*

The English philosopher Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) applied a mechanistic world view to his political philosophy. In his opinion, kings ruled with absolute power, but not by divine right. Rather, power had been given to them by their subjects in exchange for protection and an end to the violence and chaos that characterized the state of nature.


**MEN BY NATURE EQUALL**

Nature hath made men so equall, in the faculties of body, and mind; as that though there bee found one man sometimes manifestly stronger in body, or of quicker mind then another; yet when all is reckoned together, the difference between man, and man, is not so considerable, as that one man can thereupon claim to himselfe any benefit, to which another may not pretend, as well as he. For as to the strength of body, the weakest has strength enough to kill the strongest, either by secret machination, or by confederacy with others, that are in the same danger with himselfe.

And as to the faculties of the mind, (setting aside the arts grounded upon words, and especially that skill of proceeding upon generall, and infallible rules, called Science; which very few have, and but in few things; as being not a native faculty, born with us; nor attained, (as Prudence,) while we look after somewhat els,) I find yet a greater equality amongst men, than that of strength. For Prudence, is but Experience; which equall time, equally bestowes on all men, in those things they equally apply themselves unto. That which may perhaps make such equality incredible, is but a vain concept of ones owne wisdome, which almost all men think they have in a greater degree, than the Vulgar; that is, than all men but themselves, and a few others, whom by Fame, or for concurring with themselves, they approve. For such is the nature of men, that howsoever they may acknowledge many others to be more witty, or more eloquent, or more learned; Yet they will hardly believe there be many so wise as themselves: For they see their own wit at hand, and other mens at a distance. But this proveth rather that men are in that point equall, than unequall. For there is not ordinarily a greater signe of the equall distribution of any thing, than that every man is contented with his share.

**FROM EQUALITY PROCEEDS DIFFIDENCE**

From this equality of ability, ariseth equality of hope in the attaining of our Ends. And therefore if any two men desire the same thing, which nevertheless they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies; and in the way to their End, (which is principally their owne conservation, and sometimes their delection only,) endeavour to destroy, or subdue one an other. And from hence it comes to passe, that where an Invader hath no more to feare, than an other mans single power; if one plant, sow, build, or possesse a convenient Seat, others may probably be expected to come prepared with forces united, to dispossesse, and deprive him, not only of the fruit of his labour, but also of his life, or liberty. And the Invader again is in the like danger of another.

**FROM DIFFIDENCE WARRE**

And from this diffidence of one another, there is no way for any man to secure himselfe, so reasonable, as Anticipation; that is, by force, or wiles, to master the persons of all men he can, so long, till he see no other power great enough to endanger him: And this is no more than his own conservation requireth, and is generally allowed. Also because there be some, that taking pleasure in contemplating their own power in the acts of conquest, which they pursue farther than their security requires; if others, that otherwise would be glad to be at ease within modest bounds, should not by invasion increase their power, they would not be able, long time, by standing only on their defence, to subsist. And by consequence, such augmentation of dominion over men, being necessary to a mans conservation, it ought to be allowed him.

Againe, men have no pleasure, (but on the contrary a great deale of grieve) in keeping company, where there is no power able to over-awe them all. For every man looketh that his companion should value him, at the same rate he sets upon himselfe: And upon all signes of contempt, or undervaluing, naturally endeavours, as far as he dares (which amongst them that have no common power to keep them in quiet, is far enough to make them destroy each other,) to extort a greater value from his contemners, by dommage; and from others, by the example.

So that in the nature of man, we find three principall causes of quarrell. First, Competition; Secondly, Diffidence; Thirdly, Glory.

The first, maketh men invade for Gain; the second, for Safety; and the third, for Reputation. The first use Violence, to make themselves Masters of other mens persons, wives, children, and cattell; the second, to defend them; the third, for
trifles, as a word, a smile, a different opinion, and any other signe of undervalue, either direct in their Persons, or by reflexion in their Kindred, their Friends, their Nation, their Profession, or their Name.

OUT OF CIVIL STATES, THERE IS ALWAYS WARRE OF EVERYONE AGAINST EVERY ONE

Hereby it is manifest, that during the time men live without a common Power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called Warre; and such a warre, as is of every man, against every man. For Warre, consisteth not in Battell onely, or the act of fighting; but in a tract of time, wherein the Will to contend by Battell is sufficiently known: and therefore the notion of Time, is to be considered in the nature of Warre; as it is in the nature of Weather. For as the nature of Foule weather, lyeth not in a showre or two of rain; but in an inclination thereto of many dayes together: So the nature of War, consisteth not in actuall fighting; but in the known disposition thereto, during all the time there is no assurance to the contrary. All other time is Peace.

THE INCONMODITIES OF SUCH A WAR

Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of Warre, where every man is Enemy to every man; the same is consequent to the time, wherein men live without other security, than what their own strength, and their own invention shall furnish them withall. In such condition, there is 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; no Society; and which is worst of all, continuall feare, and danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

It may seem strange to some man, that has not well weighed these things; that Nature should thus dissociate, and render men apt to invade, and destroy one another: and he may therefore, not trusting to this Inference, made from the Passions, desire perhaps to have the same confirmed by Experience. Let him therefore consider with himselfe, when taking a journey, he armes himselfe, and seeks to go well accompanied; when going to sleep, he locks his dores; when even in his house he locks his chests; and this when he knowes there bee Lawes, and publike Officers, armed, to revenge all injuries shall bee done him; what opinion he has of his fellow subjects, when he rides armed; of his fellow Citizens, when he locks his dores; and of his children, and servants, when he locks his chests. Does he not there as much accuse mankind by his actions, as I do by my words? But neither of us accuse mans nature in it. The Desires, and other Passions of man, are in themselves no Sin. No more are the Actions, that proceed from those Passions, till they know a Law that forbids them: which till Lawes be made they cannot know: nor can any Law be made, till they have agreed upon the Person that shall make it.

It may peradventure be thought, there was never such a time, nor condition of warre as this; and I believe it was never generally so, over all the world: but there are many places, where they live so now. For the savage people in many places of America, except the government of small Families, the concord whereof dependeth on naturall lust, have no government at all; and live at this day in that brutish manner, as I said before. Howsoever, it may be perceived what manner of life there would be, where there were no common Power to feare; by the manner of life, which men that have formerly lived under a peacefull government, use to degenerate into, in a civill Warre.

But though there had never been any time, wherein particular men were in a condition of warre one against another; yet in all times, Kings, and Persons of Soveraigne authority, because of their Independency, are in continuall jealousies, and in the state and posture of Gladiators; having their weapons pointing, and their eyes fixed on one another; that is, their Forts, Garrisons, and Guns upon the Frontiers of their Kingdomes; and continuall Spyes upon their neighbores, which is a posture of War. But because they uphold thereby, the Industry of their Subjects; there does not follow from it, that misery, which accompanies the Liberty of particular men.

IN SUCH A WARRE, NOTHING IS UNJUST

To this warre of every man against every man, this also is consequent; that nothing can be Unjust. The notions of Right and Wrong, Justice and Injustice have there no place. Where there is no common Power, there is no Law: where no Law, no Injustice. Force, and Fraud, are in warre the two Cardinal virtues. Justice, and Injustice are none of the Faculties neither of the Body, nor Mind. If they were, they might be in a man that were alone in the world, as well as his Senses, and Passions. They are Qualities, that relate to men in Society, not in Solitude. It is consequent also to the same condition, that there be no Propriety, no Dominion, no Mine and Thine distinct; but onely that to be every mans, that he can get; and for so long, as he can keep it. And thus much for the ill condition, which man by meer Nature is actually placed in; though with a possibility to come out of it, consisting partly in the Passions, partly in his Reason.
THE PASSIONS THAT INCLINE MEN TO PEACE

The Passions that encline men to Peace, are Feare of Death; Desire of such things as are necessary to commodious living; and a Hope by their Industry to obtain them. And Reason suggesteth convenient Articles of Peace, upon which men may be drawn to agreement. These Articles, are they, which otherwise are called the Lawes of Nature: whereof I shall speak more particularly, in the two following Chapters.

**Question:**
1. What are the causes of perpetual war that is the state of nature?
13.5 Rejecting Aristotle: Galileo Defends the Heliocentric View

Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) was the foremost mathematician and physicist of his day. With the help of a telescope he helped refine, Galileo made astronomical discoveries that supported Copernicus' heliocentric view of the Universe. In addition, his contributions to terrestrial mechanics paved the way for Newtonian physics.


THIRD LETTER ON SUNSPOTS, FROM GALILEO GALILEI TO MARK WELSER

In which Venus, the Moon, and the Medicean Planets are also dealt with, and new appearances of Saturn are revealed.

[In my opinion we need not entirely give up contemplating things just because they are very remote from us, unless we have indeed determined that it is best to defer every act of reflection in favor of other occupations. For in our speculating we either seek to penetrate the true and internal essence of natural substances, or content ourselves with a knowledge of some of their properties. The former I hold to be as impossible an undertaking with regard to the closest elemental substances as with more remote celestial things. The substances composing the earth and the moon seem to me to be equally unknown, as do those of our elemental clouds and of sunspots. I do not see that in comprehending substances near at hand we have any advantage except copious detail; all the things among which men wander remain equally unknown, and we pass by things both near and far with very little or no real acquisition of knowledge. When I ask what the substance of clouds may be and am told that it is a moist vapor, I shall wish to know in turn what vapor is. Peradventure I shall be told that it is water, which when attenuated by heat is resolved into vapor. Equally curious about what water is, I shall then seek to find that out, ultimately learning that it is this fluid body which runs in our rivers and which we constantly handle. But this final information about water is no more intimate than what I knew about clouds in the first place; it is merely closer at hand and dependent upon more of the senses. In the same way I know no more about the true essences of earth or fire than about those of the moon or sun, for that knowledge is withheld from us, and is not to be understood until we reach the state of blessedness.

But if what we wish to fix in our minds is the apprehension of some properties of things, then it seems to me that we need not despair of our ability to acquire this respecting distant bodies just as well as those close at hand—and perhaps in some cases even more precisely in the former than in the latter. Who does not understand the periods and movements of the planets better than those of the waters of our various oceans? Was not the spherical shape of the moon discovered long before that of the earth, and much more easily? Is it not still argued whether the earth rests motionless or goes wandering, whereas we know positively the movements of many stars? Hence I should infer that although it may be vain to seek to determine the true substance of the sunspots, still it does not follow that we cannot know some properties of them, such as their location, motion, shape, size, opacity, mutability, generation, and dissolution. These in turn may become the means by which we shall be able to philosophize better about other and more controversial qualities of natural substances. And finally by elevating us to the ultimate end of our labors, which is the love of the divine Artificer, this will keep us steadfast in the hope that we shall learn every other truth in Him, the source of all light and verity.

Your Excellency remarks that at your first reading of my tract on floating bodies it appeared paradoxical to you, but that in the end the conclusions were seen to be true and clearly demonstrated. You will be pleased to learn that the same has happened here with many persons who have the reputation of good judgment and sound reasoning. There remain in opposition to my work some stern defenders of every minute point of the Peripatetics. So far as I can see, their education consisted in being nourished from infancy on the opinion that philosophizing is and can be nothing but to make a comprehensive survey of the texts of Aristotle, that from divers passages they may quickly collect and throw together a great number of solutions to any proposed problem. They wish never to raise their eyes from those pages—as if this great book of the universe had been written to be read by nobody but Aristotle, and his eyes had been destined to see for all posterity.

Now I fail to see any reason for placing the spots with things differing from them in a hundred ways and having but a single property in common, instead of with things that agree with them in every way. I liken the sunspots to clouds or smokes. Surely if anyone wished to imitate them by means of earthly materials, no better model could be found than to put some
drops of incombustible bitumen on a red-hot iron plate. From the black spot thus impressed on the iron, there will arise a black smoke that will disperse in strange and changing shapes. And if anyone were to insist that continual food and nourishment would have to be supplied for the refueling of the immense light that our great lamp, the sun, continually diffuses through the universe, then we have countless experiences harmoniously agreeing in showing us the conversion of burning materials first into something black or dark in color. Thus we see wood, straw, paper, candlewicks, and every burning thing to have its flame planted in and rising from neighboring parts of the material that have first become black. It might even be that if we more accurately observed the bright spots on the sun that I have mentioned, we should find them occurring in the very places where large dark spots had been a short time before. But as to this I do not mean to assert anything positively, nor to oblige myself to defend the conjecture, for I do not wish to mix dubious things with those which are definite and certain.

I believe that there are not a few Peripatetics on this side of the Alps who go about philosophizing without any desire to learn the truth and the causes of things, for they deny these new discoveries or jest about them, saying that they are illusions. It is about time for us to jest right back at these men and say that they likewise have become invisible and inaudible. They go about defending the inalterability of the sky, a view which perhaps Aristotle himself would abandon in our age.

**Question:**
1. What arguments does Galileo refute? How does he defend his own views?
13.6 Rethinking the Bible: Galileo Confronts his Critics

Galileo Galilei's (1564–1642) support of the Copernican system brought him into conflict with the church. In defense of his position, he argued that the Bible does not teach us how the heavens go, but rather how to go to Heaven. He was eventually forced to renounce his views and lived out the last years of his life under house arrest.


GALILEO GALILEI TO THE MOST SERENE GRAND DUCHESS MOTHER:

Some years ago, as Your Serene Highness well knows, I discovered in the heavens many things that had not been seen before our own age. The novelty of these things, as well as some consequences which followed from them in contradiction to the physical notions commonly held among academic philosophers, stirred up against me no small number of professors—as if I had placed these things in the sky with my own hands in order to upset nature and overturn the sciences. They seemed to forget that the increases of known truths stimulates the investigation, establishment, and growth of the arts; not their diminution or destruction.

Showing a greater fondness for their own opinions than for truth, they sought to deny and disprove the new things which, if they had cared to look for themselves, their own senses would have demonstrated to them. To this end they hurled various charges and published numerous writings filled with vain arguments, and they made the grave mistake of sprinkling these with passages taken from places in the Bible which they had failed to understand properly, and which were ill suited to their purposes.

These men would perhaps not have fallen into such error had they but paid attention to a most useful doctrine of St. Augustine’s, relative to our making positive statements about things which are obscure and hard to understand by means of reason alone. Speaking of a certain physical conclusion about the heavenly bodies, he wrote: “Now keeping always our respect for moderation in grave piety, we ought not to believe anything inadvisedly on a dubious point, lest in favor to our error we conceive a prejudice against something that truth hereafter may reveal to be not contrary in any way to the sacred books of either the Old or the New Testament.”

Persisting in their original resolve to destroy me and everything mine by any means they can think of, these men are aware of my views in astronomy and philosophy. They know that as to the arrangement of the parts of the universe, I hold the sun to be situated motionless in the center of the revolution of the celestial orbs while the earth rotates on its axis and revolves about the sun. They know also that I support this position not only by refuting the arguments of Ptolemy and Aristotle, but by producing many counterarguments; in particular, some which relate to physical effects whose causes can perhaps be assigned in no other way. In addition there are astronomical arguments derived from many things in my new celestial discoveries that plainly confute the Ptolemaic system while admirably agreeing with and confirming the contrary hypothesis. Possibly because they are disturbed by the known truth of other propositions of mine which differ from those commonly held, and therefore mistrusting their defense so long as they confine themselves to the field of philosophy, these men have resolved to fabricate a shield for their fallacies out of the mantle of pretended religion and the authority of the Bible. These they apply, with little judgment, to the refutation of arguments that they do not understand and have not even listened to.

First they have endeavored to spread the opinion that such propositions in general are contrary to the Bible and are consequently damnable and heretical. They know that it is human nature to take up causes whereby a man may oppress his neighbor, no matter how unjustly, rather than those from which a man may receive some just encouragement. Hence they have had no trouble in finding men who would preach the damnable and heresy of the new doctrine and its followers but to all mathematics and mathematicians in general. Next, becoming bolder, and hoping (though vainly) that this seed which first took root in their hypocritical minds would send out branches and ascend to heaven, they began scattering rumors among the people that before long this doctrine would be condemned by the supreme authority. They know, too,

1 De Genesi ad literam, end of bk. ii. (Citations of theological works are taken from Galileo’s marginal notes, without verification.)
that official condemnation would not only suppress the two propositions which I have mentioned, but would render
damnable all other astronomical and physical statements and observations that have any necessary relation or connection
with these.

In order to facilitate their designs, they seek so far as possible (at least among the common people) to make this
opinion seem new and to belong to me alone. They pretend not to know that its author, or rather its restorer and confirmer,
was Nicholas Copernicus; and that he was not only a Catholic, but a priest and a canon. He was in fact so esteemed by the
church that when the Lateran Council under Leo X took up the correction of the church calendar, Copernicus was called
to Rome from the most remote parts of Germany to undertake its reform. At that time the calendar was defective because
the true measures of the year and the lunar month were not exactly known.

Since that time not only has the calendar been regulated by his teachings, but tables of all the motions of the planets have
been calculated as well.

Now as to the false aspersions which they so unjustly seek to cast upon me, I have thought it necessary to justify myself
in the eyes of all men, whose judgment in matters of religion and of reputation I must hold in great esteem.

To this end they make a shield of their hypocritical zeal for religion. They go about invoking the Bible, which they would
have minister to their deceitful purposes. Contrary to the sense of the Bible and the intention of the holy Fathers, if I am
not mistaken, they would extend such authorities until even in purely physical matters—where faith is not involved—they
would have us altogether abandon reason and the evidence of our senses in favor of some biblical passage, though under
the surface meaning of its words this passage may contain a different sense.

I hope to show that I proceed with much greater piety than they do, when I argue not against condemning this
book, but against condemning it in the way they suggest—that is, without understanding it, weighing it, or so much as read-
ing it. For Copernicus never discusses matters of religion or faith, nor does he use arguments that depend in any way
upon the authority of sacred writings which he might have interpreted erroneously. He stands always upon physical con-
cclusions pertaining to the celestial motions, and deals with them by astronomical and geometrical demonstrations, founded
primarily upon sense experiences and very exact observations. He did not ignore the Bible, but he knew very well that if
his doctrine were proved, then it could not contradict the Scriptures when they were rightly understood.

Therefore I declare (and my sincerity will make itself manifest) not only that I mean to submit myself freely and renounce
any errors into which I may fall in this discourse through ignorance of matters pertaining to religion, but that I do not desire
in these matters to engage in disputes with anyone, even on points that are disputable. My goal is this alone; that if, among
errors that may abound in these considerations of a subject remote from my profession, there is anything that may be ser-
viceable to the holy Church in making a decision concerning the Copernican system, it may be taken and utilized as seems
best to the superiors. And if not, let my book be torn and burnt, as I neither intend nor pretend to gain from it any fruit that
is not pious and Catholic.

I think that in discussions of physical problems we ought to begin not from the authority of scriptural passages, but from
sense-experiences and necessary demonstrations; for the holy Bible and the phenomena of nature proceed alike from the
divine Word, the former as the dictate of the Holy Ghost and the latter as the observant executrix of God’s commands. It is
necessary for the Bible, in order to be accommodated to the understanding of every man, to speak many things which
appear to differ from the absolute truth so far as the bare meaning of the words is concerned. But Nature, on the other
hand, is inexorable and immutable; she never transgresses the laws imposed upon her, or cares a whit whether her abstruse
reasons and methods of operation are understandable to men. For that reason it appears that nothing physical which sense-
experience sets before our eyes, or which necessary demonstrations prove to us, ought to be called in question (much less
condemned) upon the testimony of biblical passages which may have some different meaning beneath their words. For the
Bible is not chained in every expression to conditions as strict as those which govern all physical effects; nor is God any less
excellently revealed in Nature’s actions than in the sacred statements of the Bible.
From this I do not mean to infer that we need not have an extraordinary esteem for the passages of holy Scripture. On the contrary, having arrived at any certainties in physics, we ought to utilize these as, the most appropriate aids in the true exposition of the Bible and in the investigation of those meanings which are necessarily contained therein, for these must be concordant with demonstrated truths. I should judge that the authority of the Bible was designed to persuade men of those articles and propositions which, surpassing all human reasoning, could not be made credible by science, or by any other means than through the very mouth of the Holy Spirit.

Yet even in those propositions which are not matters of faith, this authority ought to be preferred over that of all human writings which are supported only by bare assertions or probable arguments, and not set forth in a demonstrative way. This I hold to be necessary and proper to the same extent that divine wisdom surpasses all human judgment and conjecture.

But I do not feel obliged to believe that that same God who has endowed us with senses, reason, and intellect has intended to forgo their use and by some other means to give us knowledge which we can attain by them. He would not require us to deny sense and reason in physical matters which are set before our eyes and minds by direct experience or necessary demonstrations.

Question:
1. How does Galileo’s interpretation of the Bible respond to his critics’ use of the Bible to attack his views? How does he embrace scientific principles?
14.1 Before Europe: The Zheng He Expeditions

The Muslim eunuch Zheng He (spelled Cheng Ho in the document below) undertook seven expeditions by sea to India and Africa, nearly a century before Columbus sailed the Atlantic. While Columbus sailed with about 100 men, the Chinese crew, all state servants, consisted of thousands of men, ranging from civil officers and soldiers to scribes and cooks. The ships too dwarfed Columbus’, with 62 galleons and more than 100 auxiliary vessels. The largest ships each had 9 masts and 12 sails, measured $440 \times 180$, and weighed 1500 tons. Columbus’ three ships had three masts each, were $150' \times 415$ tons all together. A stone tablet, engraved in 1432, commemorates the expeditions, part of which is excerpted below.


The Imperial Ming dynasty in unifying seas and continents... even goes beyond the Han and the Tang. The countries beyond the horizon and from the ends of the earth have all become subjects.... Thus the barbarians from beyond the seas... have come to audience bearing precious objects.... The emperor has ordered us, Cheng Ho... to make manifest the transforming power of the Imperial virtue and to treat distant people with kindness.... We have seven times received the commission of ambassadors [and have visited] altogether more than thirty countries large and small. We have traversed immense water spaces and have beheld huge waves like mountains rising sky-high, and we have set eyes on barbarian regions far away hidden in a blue transparency of light vapors, while our sails loftily unfurled like clouds day and night continued their course, traversing those savage waves as if we were treading a public thoroughfare.... We have received the high favor of a gracious commission of our Sacred Lord, to carry to the distant barbarians the benefits of his auspicious example.... Therefore we have recorded the years and months of the voyages. [Here follows a detailed record of places visited and things one on each of the seven voyages.] We have anchored in this port awaiting a north wind to take the sea... and have thus recorded an inscription in stone... erected by the principal envoys, the Grand Eunuchs Cheng Ho and Wang Ching-hung, and the assistant envoys.

**Questions:**
1. How do the Chinese, in this document, perceive their role in these expeditions?
2. How do the Chinese perceive those they meet in traveling?
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14.2 From King to King: Letters from Kongo to Portugal

The Portuguese made contact with the kingdom of Kongo in Africa in the 1480s. By the 1490s, King John I of Kongo and some of his nobles were baptized as Christians. He and his successors and the king of Portugal exchanged letters for the next half century. Excerpts from the Kongo kings’ letters appear below.


PORTUGUESE MILITARY AID DURING CIVIL WAR (1512)

And our brother who usurped us, and without justice occupied us, with arms and a great number of people... became empowered in all of our kingdom, and lordships, with which when we saw the only solution for our person we feigned sickness; and it being so with us, by a divine inspiration of our Lord, we raised and strengthened ourself, and called up our 36 men, and went with them to the main square of the city, where our Father died, and where people of infinite number were with our said brother, and... for our Lord Jesus Christ, and we began to fight with our adversaries... our 36 men, inspired by grace, and aided by God, our adversaries quickly fled... and chaos ensued, and with them witnessing... there appeared in the air a white Cross, and the blessed Apostle St. James with many men armed and on horseback, and dressed in white battle garments, and killed them, and so great was the chaos, and mortality, that it was a thing of great wonder.

In this defeat our brother was taken prisoner and with justice condemned to die, as he died, for having rebelled against us; and finally we made peace in our kingdoms... as it is today, with the Grace of God... and through the miracle made by our Lord, and we send word to the King Dom Emanuel of Portugal... and we send to him Dom Pedro our brother, who was one of the 36 men with us... and with the letters that the king sent of great works given....

And as the King of Portugal saw the good example... followed... for the greater growth of our Holy Catholic Faith, he sent by our cousin Dom Pedro and by Simao da Sylva noblemen of your house who came with him, the arms pictured in this card, and the shields with insignias... [A]nd as these weapons arrived a cross was seen in the sky, and so the Apostle St. James and all the other Saints fought with us, and with the help of our Lord God we were given victory, and so also as by the King sent us his [men] took part with the said arms....

PROBLEMS IN CONVERSION EFFORTS (1515)

Very High and Powerful Lord,

We the King Dom Alfonso... Lord, much holy grace and praise I give to the Holy God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit... all good and holy things are done through the will of God, without which we can do nothing... our faith is still like glass in this kingdom, due to the bad examples of the men who come here to teach it, because through worldly greed for a few riches truth is destroyed, as through greed the Jews crucified the Son of God, my brother, until today he is crucified through bad examples and bad deeds... in our time by us who walk crying in this real valley of misery and tears. 

... [I]n teaching the word of Our Lord [these bad priests] become bad examples and so take the key to the Celestial Kingdom that is the Doctrine of our Holy Catholic Faith, to open the hearts of our simple people... and by entering into a life of sin take the key to Hell... due to the greed of this world, do not merely take their own bodies and souls to Hell, but guide those most blind with them through their bad examples. I ask of you, Brother, to aid me in establishing our Holy Catholic Faith, because, Lord my Brother, for us it were better... that the souls of our relatives and brothers and cousins and nephews and grandchildren who are innocent, to see... good examples.

... I ask you to send stonemasons and house carpenters to build a school to teach our relatives and our people, because Lord, although greedy and jealous men still give bad examples... with the Holy Sacred Scripture we may change that, because the world of the Holy Spirit is contrary to the world, the flesh and the devil....

ATTEMPTS TO BUY A CARAVEL (1517)

Very Powerful and Very High Prince and King My Brother

... I have several times written you of the necessity of having a ship, telling you to make me one to buy, and I don’t know why Your Highness does not want to consent, because I want nothing more than... to use it in God’s service....


**EFFECTS OF PORTUGUESE TRADE (1526)**

... [Y]our factors and officials give to the men and merchants that come to this Kingdom... and spread... so that many vassals owing us obedience... rebel because they have more goods [through trade with Portuguese] than us, who before had been content and subject to our... jurisdiction, which causes great damage....

... And each day these merchants take our citizens, native to the land and children of our nobles and vassals, and our relations, because they are thieves and men of bad conscience, steal them with the desire to have things of this kingdom... take them to sell... our land is all spoiled... which is not to your service.... For this we have no more necessity for other than priests and educators, but [send] no more merchandise... nor merchants....

**EXPANSION AND REGULATION OF THE SLAVE TRADE (1526)**

[M]any of our subjects, through the desire for merchandise and things of this Kingdoms which you bring... to satisfy their appetite, steal many of our free and exempt subjects. And nobles and their children and our relatives are often stolen to be sold to white men... hidden by night.... And the said white men are so powerful... they embark and... buy them, for which we want justice, restoring them to liberty....

And to avoid this great evil, by law all white men in our kingdom who buy slaves... must make it known to three nobles and officials of our court... to see these slaves....

**Questions:**
1. How did the Kongo kings respond to the Portuguese early in their relationship? Why?
2. How did this change over time? Why?
14.3 “The Chronicle of Peru: The Incas”

The Incas lived in the Andes mountains, on the western coast of South America from about 1100. Much of what we know about the Incas comes from accounts by the Spanish who destroyed the Inca empire in the mid-1500s. Pedro Cieza de Leon, one such nobleman and soldier, wrote The Chronicle of Peru in 1547–1550, immediately after his involvement in the military campaigns against the Incas. Relying on first-hand accounts from the Incas, his “Chronicle” is considered one of the most authoritative accounts available.


It should be well understood that great prudence was needed to enable these kings to govern such large provinces, extending over so vast a region, parts of it rugged and covered with forests, parts mountainous, with snowy peaks and ridges, parts consisting of deserts of sand, dry and without trees or water. These regions were inhabited by many different nations, with varying languages, laws, religions, and the kings had to maintain tranquility and to rule so that all should live in peace and in friendship towards their lord. Although the city of Cuzco was the head of the empire,... yet at certain points, as we shall also explain, the king stationed his delegates and governors, who were the most learned, the ablest, and the bravest men that could be found, and none was so youthful that he was not already in the last third part of his age. As they were faithful and none betrayed their trusts,... none of the natives, though they might be more powerful, attempted to rise in rebellion; or if such a thing ever did take place, the town where the revolt broke out was punished, and the ringleaders were sent prisoners to Cuzco....

All men so feared the king, that they did not dare to speak evil even of his shadow. And this was not all. If any of the king’s captains or servants went forth to visit a distant part of the empire on some business, the people came out on the road with presents to receive them, not daring, even if one came alone, to omit to comply with all his commands.

So great was the veneration that the people felt for their princes, throughout this vast region, that every district was as well regulated and governed as if the lord was actually present to chastise those who acted contrary to his rules. This fear arose from the known valor of the lords and their strict justice. It was felt to be certain that those who did evil would receive punishment without fail, and that neither prayers nor bribes would avert it. At the same time, the Incas always did good to those who were under their sway, and would not allow them to be ill-treated, nor that too much tribute should be exacted from them. Many who dwelt in a sterile country where they and their ancestors have lived with difficulty, found that through the orders of the Inca their lands were made fertile and abundant, the things being supplied which before were wanting. In other districts, where there was scarcity of clothing, owing to the people having no flocks, orders were given that cloth should be abundantly provided. In short, it will be understood that these lords knew how to enforce service and the payment of tribute, so they provided for the maintenance of the people, and took care that they should want for nothing. Through these good works, and because the lord always gave women and rich gifts to his principal vassals, he gained so much on their affections that he was most fondly loved....

One of the things which I admired most, in contemplating and noting down the affairs of this kingdom, was to think how and in what manner they can have made such grand and admirable roads as we now see, and what a number of men would suffice for their construction, and with what tools and instruments they can have leveled the mountains and broken through the rocks to make them so broad and good as they are. For it seems to me that if the King of Spain should desire to give orders for another royal road to be made, like that which goes from Quito to Cuzco,... with all his power I believe that he could not get it done; nor could any force of men achieve such results unless there was also the perfect order by means of which the commands of the Incas were carried into execution....

Questions:
1. What does the author find to admire about the Incas?
2. What can we learn about Spain from what he says about the Incas?
3. How do you think he could both praise the Incas and participate in their destruction?
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14.4 The Jamestown Charter

The colony of Jamestown became the first permanent English settlement in America. Though the colony almost failed, because of disease, hunger, and Indian attacks, it survived with the arrival of new men and more supplies. The following excerpt comes from the letters patent (or First Charter) from the English government in 1606.


I. 10 April 1606.
Letters patent to Sir Thomas Gates and others.

James by the grace of God &c Whereas our loving and well disposed subiects Sir Thomas Gates and Sir George Somers Knightes Richard Hackluit Clarke prebendarie of Westminster and Edwarda Maria Winghfeilde Thomas Hannam and Raleighe Gilberde Esquiers William Parker and George Popham Gentlemen and divers others of our loving subiects have been humble suitors vnto vs that wee woulde vouchsafe vnto them our licence to make habitacion plantaion and to deduce a Colonie of sondrie of our people into that parte of America commonly called Virginia and other parts and territories in America either appertaining vnto vs or which are not nowe actuallie possessed by anie Christian Prince or people scituate lying and being all along the sea Coastes

and to that ende and for the more speedy accomplishemente of theire saide intended plantacion and habitacion there are desirous to devide themselues into two severall Colonies and Companies the one consisting of certaine Knightes Gentle-men marchauntes and other Adventurers of our Cittie of London and elsewhere

and the other consisting of sondrie Knightes Gentlemen merchauntes and other Adventurers of our Citties of Bristoll and Exeter and of our towne of Plymouthe and of other places which doe ioyne themselues vnto that Colonie

wee greatly commending and graciously accepting of theire desires to the furtherance of soe noble a worke which may be the providence of Almighty God hereafter tende to the glorie of his divyne maiestie in propagating of Christian religion to suche people as yet live in darkenesse and myserable ignorance of the true knowledge and worshippe of god and may in tyme bring the infidels and salvages lyving in those partes to humane civilitie and to a setled and quiet govermente doe by theise our lettres Patentes graciously accepte of and agree to theire humble and well intended desires

And that they shall haue all the landes woodes soyle Groundes havens portes Ryvers Mynes Myneralls Marshes waters Fyshings Commodities and hereditamences whatsoever from the said first seate of theire plantaion and habytacion by the space of Fyftie miles of Englishe statute measure all alongest the saide Coaste of Virginia and America towards the Weste and southeweste as the Coaste lyeth with all the Islandes within one hundred myles directlie over againste the same sea Coaste

and towards the Easte and Northeaste

And directly into the mayne lande by the space of One hundred like Englishe myles and shall and may inhabyt and remaine there and shall and may alsoe buylde and fortifie within anie the same for theire better safegarde and defence according to theire best discrecions and the direction of the Counsell of that Colonie and that noe other of our subjects shalbe permitted or suffered to plante or inhabyt behinde or on the backside of them towards the mayne lande without the expresse lycence or consente of the Counsell of that Colonie thereunto in writing firste had or obtained
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And wee doe alsoe ordaine establishe and agree for vs our heires and successors that eache of the saide Colonies shall haue a Counsell which shall governe and order all matters and Causes which shall arise growe or happen to or within the same severall Colonies according to such lawes ordynaunces and Instructions as shalbe in that behalfe given and signed with our hande or signe manuell and passe vnder the privie seale of our Realme of Englane Eache of which Counsells shall consist of Thirteene parsons [i.e., persons] and to be ordained made and removed from tyme to tyme according as shalbe directed and comprised in the same Instructions and shall haue a severall seale for all matters that shall passe or concerne the same severall Counsells Eache of which seales shalbe haue the Kings Armes engraven on the one syde thereof and hys pourtraiture on the other

And that alsoe ther shalbe a Counsell established here in Englande which shall in like manner consist of thirteene parsons to be for that purpose appointed by vs our heires and successors which shalbe called our Counsell of Virginia And shall from tyme to tyme haue the superior managing and direction onelie of and for all matters that shall or may concerne the govermente aswell of the said seuerall Colonies as of and for anie other parte or place within the aforesaid preinctes

And moreover wee doe graunte and agree for vs our heires and successors that the saide severall Counsells of and for the saide severall Colonies shall and lawfully may by vertue hereof from tyme to tyme without intervpcion of vs our heires or successors giue and take order to digg myne and searche for all manner of Mynes of Goulde Silver and Copper aswell within anie parte of theire saide severall Colonies as of the said Mayne landes on the backeside of the same Colonies and to haue and enjoy the Goulde Silver and Copper to be gotten thereof to the vse and behoofe of the same Colonies and the plantacions thereof yielding therefore yerelie to vs our heires and successors the Fifte parte onelie of all the same Goulde and Silver and the Fifteenth parte of all the same Copper soe to be gotten or had as ys aforesaide without anie other manner of profytt or Accompte to be given or yeilded to vs our heires or successors for or in respecte of the same

And that they shall or lawfullie may establishe and cause to be made a coyne to passe currant there betweene the people of those severall Colonies for the more ease of traffique and bargaining betweene and amongst them and the natives there of such mettall and in suche manner and forme as the same severall Counsells there shall lymitt and appointe

Moreover wee doe by theise presentes for vs our heires and successors giue and graunte licence vnto the said Sir Thomas Gates Sir George Sumers Richarde Hackluite Edwarde Maria Winghfeilde Thomas Hannam Raleighe Gilberde William Parker and George Popham and to everie of the said Colonies that they and may from tyme to tyme for ever hereafter for their severall defeences encounter or expulse repell and resist as well by sea as by lande by all waies and meanes whatsoever all and everie suche parson and parsons as without especiall licence of the said severall Colonies and plantacions shall attempt to inhabit within the saide seuerall precinctes and lymittes of the saide severall Colonies and plantacions or anie of them or that shall enterprise or attempt at anie tyme hereafter the hurte detrymente or annoyance of the saide severall Colonies or plantacions

Alsoe wee doe vor vs our heires and successor declare by theise presentes that all and everie the parsons being our subiectes which shall dwell and inhabit within everie or anie of the saide severall Colonies and plantacions and everie of theire children which shall happen to be borne within the lymittes and precinctes of the said severall Colonies and plantacyons shalbe haue and enjoy all liberties Franchises and Immunities within anie of our other domynions to all intentes and purposes as ys they had been abyding and borne within this our Realme of Englane or anie other of our saide Domynions

Provided alwaies and our will and pleasure ys and wee doe hereby declare to all Christian Kings Princes and estastes that ys our parson or parsons which shall hereafter be of anie of the said severall Colonies and plantacions or anie other by his there or anie of theire licence or appointemente shall at anie tyme or tymes hereafter robb or spoile by sea or by lande or doe anie Acte of vnjust and vnlawfull hostilitie to anie of the subiectes of vs our heires or successors or anie of the subiectes of anie King Prince Ruler Governor or State being then in league or Amitie with vs our heires or successors and that vs or anie suche Injuriie or vpon juste complainte of such Prince Ruler Governour or State or theire subiects wee our heires or successors shall make open proclamacion within anie of the portes of our Realme of Englane commodious for that purpose that the saide parson or parsons having committed anie such Robberie or spoyle shall within the tearme to be lymitted by suche Proclamacions make full restitucion or satisfactin of all suche Injiuries done soe as the saide Princes or others soe complained may houlde themselves fully satisfied and contented and that ys the saide parson or parsons having committed
such robberie or spoyle shall not make or cause to be made satisfaction accordingly with such tyme soe to be lymitted
That then yt shalbe lawfull to vs our heires and successors to put the saide parson or parsons having comitted such robberie or spoyle and theire procurers Abbettors or Comfortors out of our allegeaunce and protection and that yt shalbe lawfull and free for all Princes and others to pursue with hostilitie the saide Offenders and everie of them and theire and everie of theire procurors Ayders Abbettors and comforters in that behalfe

Questions:
1. Why did these Englishmen want to form colonies in the new lands?
2. Of what advantage was this to England?
14.5 First Contact: The English Describe Pawatah’s People

When the English arrived, they recorded their impressions of the countryside and of the people already living in the area, the Pawatah. The description of the Pawatah follows.


15. 21 May-21 June 1607.
Description of the People.

A Brief description of the People.

There is a king in this land called great Pawatah, vnder whose dominions are at least 20th several kingdomes, yet each king potent as a prince in his owne territory, these have their Subjectes at so quick Comaund, as a beck bringes obedience, even to the resticucion of stolne goodes which by their naturall inclination they are loth to leave. They goo all naked save their privytes, yet in coole weather they were deare skinns, with the hayre on loose: some have leather stockinges vp to their twisties, sandalls on their feet, their hayre is black generally, which they weare long on the left side, tyed on a knob, about which knott the kings and best among them have a kind of Coronett of deares hayre coloured redd, some have chaines of long linckt copper about their neckes, and some chaines of pearle, the comon sort stick long fethers in this knob, I found not a grey eye among them all. their skynn is tawny not so borne, but with dying and paynting them selues, in which they delight greatly. The women are like the men, onely this difference; their hayre growth long al over their heads save clipt somewhat short afore, these do all the labour and the men hunt and goo at their plesure.

They live commonly by the water side in litle cottages made of canes and reedes, covered with the barke of trees; they dwell as I guesse by families of kindred & allyance some 40 tie or 50 ti in a Hatto2 or small village; which townes are not past a myle or half a myle asunder in most places. They live vpon sodden wheat beanes & peaze for the most part, also they kill deare take fish in their weares, & kill fowle abundance, they eate often and that liberally; they are proper lusty streight men very strong runn exceeding swiftly, their feight is alway in the wood with bow & arrowes, & a short wodden sword, the celerity they vse in skirmish is admirable. the king directes the batle & is alwayes in front. Their manner of entertainment is vpon mattes on the ground vnder some tree, where they sitt themselues alone in the midst of the matt, & two mattes on each side, on which they[r] people sitt, then right against him (making a square forme) satt we always. when they came to their matt they have an vsher goes before them, & the rest as he sittes downe give a long showt. The people steale any thing comes neare them, yea are so practized in this art that lookeing in our face they would with their foot betwene their toes convey a chizell knife, percuer or any indifferent light thing: which having once conveyed they hold it an injury to take the same from them; They are naturally given to trechery, howbeit we could not

Questions:
1. How do the English describe the Pawatah?
2. Why might they describe them as they do? How might the description be distorted by their own beliefs, prejudices, and desires?

1 ‘The junction of the thighs’ (OED).
2 ‘Hatto’ possibly represents an element cognate with modern Cree ot'anow, ‘town’, which appears as the second element in the village name Kecoughtan. It may have been pronounced with a glottal stop or other initial throaty sound which the author recorded with an ‘h’.
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14.6 The Experiences of an Indentured Servant

While the men named in the letters patent (Document 4) were men of means (merchants and the like), others also signed on to start a new life in America. Those without money often made the passage as indentured servants, where they gave generally seven years of service to those who paid their passage. After seven years, they were again free men. The following excerpt is from a letter of one indentured servant in 1623.


**LOVING AND KIND FATHER AND MOTHER:**

My most humble duty remembered to you, hoping in god of your good health, as I myself am at the making hereof. This is to let you understand that I you child am in a most heavy case by reason of the country, [which] is such that it causeth much sic kness, [such] as the scurrury and the bloody flux and diverse other diseases, which maketh the body very poor and weak. And when we are sick there is nothing to comfort us; for since I came out of the ship I never ate anything but peas, and lobollie (that is, water gruel). As for deer or venison I never saw any since I came into this land. There is indeed some fowl, but we are not allowed to go and get it, but must work hard both early and late for a mess of water gruel and a mouthful of bread and beef. A mouthful of bread for a penny loaf must serve for four men which is most pitiful. [You would be grieved] if you did know as much as I [do], when people cry out day and night—Oh! That they were in England without their limbs—and would not care to lose any limb to be in England again, yea, though they beg from door to door. For we live in fear of the enemy every hour, yet we have had a combat with them... and we took two alive and made slaves of them. But it was by policy, for we are in great danger; for our plantation is very weak by reason of the death and sickness of our company. For we came but twenty for the merchants, and they are half dead just; and we look every hour when two more should go. Yet there came some four other men yet to live with us, of which there is but one alive; and our Lieutenant is dead, and [also] his father and his brother. And there was some five or six of the last year’s twenty, of which there is but three left, so that we are fain to get other men to plant with us; and yet we are but 32 to fight against 3000 if they should come. And the nighest help that we have is ten mile of us, and when the rogues overcame this place [the] last [time] they slew 80 persons. How then shall we do, for we lie even in their teeth? They may easily take us, but [for the fact] that God is merciful and can save with few as well as with many, as he showed to Gilead. And like Gilead’s soldiers, if they lapped water, we drink water which is but weak.

And I have nothing to comfort me, nor is there nothing to be gotten here but sickness and death, except [in the event] that one had money to lay out in some things for profit. But I have nothing at all—no, not a shirt to my back but two rags (2), nor clothes but one poor suit, nor but one pair of shoes, but one pair of stockings, but one cap, [and] but two bands [collars]. My cloak is stolen by one of my fellows, and to his dying hour [he] sould not tell me what he did with it; but some of my fellows saw him have butter and beef out of a ship, which my cloak, I doubt [not], paid for. So that I have not a penny, nor a penny worth, to help me too either spice or sugar or strong waters, without the which one cannot live here. For as strong beer in England doth fatten and strengthen them, so water here doth wash and weaken these here [and] only keeps [their] life and soul together. But I am not half [of] a quarter so strong as I was in England, and all is for want of victuals; for I do protest unto you that I have eaten more in [one] day at home than I have allowed me here for a week. You have given more than my day’s allowance to a beggar at the door; and if Mr. Jackson had not relieved me, I should be in a poor case. But he like a father and she like a loving mother doth still help me.

For when we go to Jamestown (that is 10 miles of us) there lie all the ships that come to land, and there they must deliver their goods. And when we went up to town [we would go], as it may be, on Monday at noon, and come there by night, [and] then load the next day by noon, and go home in the afternoon, and unload, and then away again in the night, and [we would] be up about midnight. Then if it rained or blowed never so hard, we must lie in the boat on the water and have nothing but a little bread. For when we go into the boat we [would] have a loaf allowed to two men, and it is all [we would get] if we stayed there two days, which is hard; and [we] must lie all that while in the boat. But that Goodman Jackson pitied me and made me a cabin to lie in always when I [would] come up, and he would give me some poor jacks [fish] [to take] home with me, which comforted me more than peas or water gruel. Oh, they be very godly folks, and love me very well, and will do anything for me. And he much marvelled that you would send me a servant to the Company; he saith I had been better knocked on the head. And indeed so I find it now, to my great grief and misery; and [I] saith that if you love me you will redeem me suddenly, for which I do entreat and beg. And if you cannot get the merchants to redeem me for some little money, then for God’s sake get a gathering or entreat some good folks to lay out some little sum of money.
in meal and cheese and butter and beef. Any eating meat will yield great profit. Oil and vinegar is very good; but, father, there is great loss in leaking. But for God’s sake send beef and cheese and butter, or the more of one sort and none of another. But if you send cheese, it must be very old cheese; and at the cheesemonger’s you may buy very food cheese for twopence farthing or halfpenny, that will be liked very well. But if you send cheese, you must have a care how you pack it in barrels; and you must put cooper’s chips between every cheese, or else the heat of the hold will rot them. And look whatsoever you send me—be in never so much—look, what[ever] I make of it, I will deal truly with you. I will send it over and beg the profit to redeem me; and if I die before it come, I have entreated Goodman Jackson to send you the worth of it, who hath promised he will. If you send, you must direct your letters to Goodman Jackson, at Jamestown, a gunsmith. (You must set down his freight, because there be more of his name there.) Good father, do not forget me, but have mercy and pity my miserable case. I know if you did but see me, you would weep to see me; for I have but one suit. (But [though] it is a strange one, it is very well guarded.) Wherefore, for God’s sake, pity me. I pray you to remember my love to all my friends and kindred. I hope all my brothers and sisters are in good health, and as for my part I have set down my resolution that certainly will be; that is, that the answer of this letter will be life or death to me. Therefore, good father, send as soon as you can; and if you send me any thing let this be the mark.

ROT
RICHARD FRETHORNE,
MARTIN’S HUNDRED

Questions:
1. How does Frethorne describe life in the colony, as it might apply to all inhabitants?
2. How does Frethorne describe specifically the life of an indentured servant?
15.1 Richelieu: Controlling the Nobility

Cardinal Richelieu (1585–1642) was a shrewd and dedicated political leader who accelerated the growth of absolutism in France. He demonstrated tremendous energy, tenacity, and imagination in directing public policy as Louis XIII’s chief minister.


ON THE NOBILITY

After having explained what I consider to be absolutely necessary for the re-establishment of your realm’s first order [the clergy], I shall proceed to the second order and say that the nobility must be considered as one of the strengths of the state, capable of contributing much to its preservation and to its stability. But for some time the nobility has been so diminished by... the century’s misfortunes that it urgently needs to be protected.... They are rich only in the courage that leads them to devote their lives freely to the state.

As it is necessary to protect them against their oppressors; it is also necessary to take special care to restrain them from exploiting their underlings. It is very common fault on the part of those born into the nobility to use violence against the common people to whom God seems to have given arms for earning a living rather than for defending themselves. It is very important to stop such disorders by a constant sternness which will make the weakest of yours, although disarmed, as secure in the shelter of your laws as those who are armed.

The nobility has demonstrated, in the recent war, that it inherited the virtue of its ancestors; it is now necessary to discipline the nobles so that they may preserve their former reputation and usefully serve the state. Men who are injurious to the public are not useful to the state; it is certain that nobility which does not serve in war is not only useless, but a burden to the state, and can be compared to a body which supports a paralyzed arm....

As gentry they merit being well treated when they do well, but it is necessary to be severe with them when they fail to do the things which their birth binds them to do. I have no qualms in saying that those who are degenerate in terms of the virtue of their ancestors, and who fail to serve the crown with their swords and with their lives, as well as with the confidence and the firmness that the laws of the state require, deserve to be deprived of the advantages of their birth and reduced to carry a part of the peoples’ burden. Since honor should be dearer to them than life, it would be more of a punishment to deprive them of the former rather than the latter. To take away the lives of these persons, who expose their lives every day for a pure fancy of honor, is much less than taking away their honor and leaving them a life which would be a perpetual anguish for them. All means must be used to maintain the nobility in the true virtue of their fathers, and one must also omit nothing to preserve the advantages they inherited.... Just as it is impossible to find a remedy for every evil, it is also very difficult to put forth a general expedient for the ends that I am proposing....

It is necessary also to distinguish between the nobility which is at court and that which is in the country.... The nobility at court will be notably relieved if the luxury and the unbearable expenditures of court life were reduced. As to the rural nobility, even though it would not receive as much relief by such a decision, because its poverty does not permit it to have such expenditures, it would also feel the effect of this remedy which is so necessary to avoid the ruin of the entire state.... Further, your majesty should control the venal provincial governments and the military expenses for which the nobility pays a large enough price with its blood.

If your majesty practiced better regulation of the expenses of his house, instead of maintaining all sorts of people who are received there through their purse, entrance would be barred in the future to those who will not have the good fortune to be born of noble birth.... Now, unfortunately, gentlemen can elevate themselves to offices and dignities only at the price of their financial.... Further, if your goodness extends itself enough to bestow honors on their children (those who possess the required learning and piety)... the nobility will be bound more closely to you, for in removing the necessity of purchasing honors which weighs them down you will give them the true means of maintaining their houses.... One will be able to do many other things for the relief of the nobility. But I have suppressed my thoughts on that subject, realizing that they would be very easy to write about but perhaps impossible to put into practice.
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THE MEANS OF PREVENTING DUELS

There have been many edicts issued to stop duels, all of them fruitless to the present. Results have been hoped for and waited for, but it has been most difficult to find an effective way to curb this rage. The French scorn their lives in such a way, as experience has made clear to us, that the most rigorous punishments have not always been the best method to stop the frenzy.

The nobility have often thought that there is much more glory in violating rather than obeying your edicts, for they believe such actions demonstrate that their honor is more important to them than their life. Nevertheless, they are in dread of losing their worldly possessions and convenience, without which they could not live happily.... The fear of losing their offices, their belongings and their freedom has a greater impact on their minds than the fear of losing their lives.

I have tried not to forget anything which would make it possible for me to suggest some remedy to cure this dangerous evil. I have often tried to determine whether some duels, within the multitude that occur every day, could be reconciled in advance. And I believe there is a marked possibility that by this means we may be able to save France from this madness. In view of the fact that those individuals found justified in engaging in combat could still do so, they should be willing to submit themselves to judges deputized to consider the seriousness of the offense, which would put a stop to the misfortune of duels. There should be few quarrels that could not be settled by compromise beforehand. I believe, along such lines, that one could abolish this barbarism which dictates that every offended man take justice into his own hands and find satisfaction in the blood of his enemies.... Unfortunately, the blindness of the nobility is so great that some would ignore the course I have suggested and continue to demand combat to soothe their vanity and give proof of their courage.

The deceased king [Henri IV] attempted this path in 1609, using all the means at his power to make it effective. He deprived the nobility of their properties, their offices, and even the lives of those who fought without permission—but to no avail. This is what has forced your majesty, after experiencing the same conditions at the beginning of his reign, to search for another remedy in his edict of March, 1626. That remedy has had a much greater effect than punishment, for it concentrates on those who value their lives less than their possessions and their liberty.

The best laws in the world are useless, however, if they are not inviolably observed. And because those who commit this offense most often cover the evidence of their duel, it is almost impossible to substantiate their crime. I have no fear in saying to your majesty that it is not enough to punish the participants in confirmed duels through the strictness of your edicts. Even when there has been only unconfirmed information, without full proof of a duel, it is absolutely necessary to apprehend the delinquents and make them prisoners at their own expense, for a long or short period according to the circumstances of their action. Otherwise the uncertainty and negligence which now marks the information your attorney generals ordinarily provide to you, plus the indulgence of the Parlements and the general corruption of the age, is such that every man esteems it an honor to aid those who have fought and then disguised their crimes, thereby rendering your edicts and your most careful efforts useless. It is in such cases that the only sure way to have your laws and ordinances followed is for your authority to pass above the form of the law in order to maintain the law and order necessary to the very existence of a state.

If your majesty orders that all encounters will be considered as duels, and will be punished as such until those who have committed them surrender themselves voluntarily as prisoners, and will be absolved or sentenced according to the law, you will have done all that can probably be done to stem the course of this rage....

THE USES OF PUNISHMENTS AND REWARDS

Punishments and rewards are two quite necessary elements in the conduct of states. It is an ordinary allegation, but more true, and often repeated by all men, that rewards and punishments are the two most important tools of government available in a realm.

It is certain that even though one can make use of no other principle than that of being inflexible in punishing those who fail to serve the state, and religiously reward those who perform some notable service, one will not govern badly, since all men will perform their duty through fear or hope. One should, however, place punishment before rewards, because if it is necessary to eliminate either of the two, it would be better to dispense with the latter than the former.

In the strictest sense good should be embraced for its own sake, for one’s love of honor, and no reward is owed to those who perform it. But because there is no duel which does not violate the sense of honor it is meant to uphold, punishment due to disobedience is always required. This obligation is so strict that on many occasions the offense cannot be left unpunished without committing a new one. I am speaking here of actions which injure the state by premeditation and not of the many others which happen by chance and by misfortune, of which princes can and should be indulgent.

Even though to pardon in such cases is a commendable thing, not to punish an offense is a criminal omission because impunity opens the door to license. Theologians and politicians are in agreement on this subject; all agree that while in certain cases it is well for the prince to grant his pardon, it would be inexcusable for officials with public responsibility to substitute lenience for severe punishment. The lesson of experience, for those who have dealt with people for a
long time, is that men easily forget favors, remain ungrateful, and become ambitious for further rewards. It is clear that pun-
ishments are a much surer means of holding each man to his duty. Men are less likely to forget things that make an impres-
sion on their emotions; it is more forceful than reason which has no power over many minds. To be rigorous with those
individuals who take pride in scorning the laws and the orders of the state is to serve the public well. One could not
commit a greater crime against the public interest than to be indulgent to those who violate it.

Among the several combinations, factions, and seditions which have occurred in this realm during my life, I have
never observed that lenience ever led any mind to naturally correct itself of its evil inclinations. But, on the contrary, it
allowed individuals to return to their troublesome ways, and often they were more successful the second time than the first.

The degree of indulgence hitherto practiced in this realm has often put it in very great and deplorable difficulties.
Whenever wrongs go unpunished, everyone will completely disregard the laws and take advantage of their position; instead
of honorable compliance with the laws, they will consider only what further profit they can obtain for themselves.

If in the past men felt that it was dangerous to live under a prince who rigorously enforced the law, they also were
aware that it was even more dangerous to live under a state in which impunity opened the door to every of license. Princes
and magistrates who fear they will commit a sin by being too strict can answer to God, but they will only be blamed by
wise men if they fail to exercise that authority which is prescribed by the laws. I have often brought this to the attention
of your majesty and I urge you again to reconsider this matter carefully, for just as there are princes who need to be turned
away from severity in order to avoid unnecessary cruelty, your majesty needs to be diverted from the fault of clemency.
This is more dangerous even than cruelty, because such leniency will later require even greater punishments.

The rod, which is the symbol of justice, must not stand idle. I am also convinced that it must not be used so strictly
that it is without mercy; but this last quality should not lead to a state of indulgence which authorizes disorders, however
small, for those disorders are injurious to the state and may cause its ruin. There are, of course, some men badly enough
advised to condemn the necessary severity in this kingdom because it has not been practiced in earlier times. It is only nec-
essary to open their eyes, and make them know that leniency has been too common in the past and has caused the break-
down of law and order, and that the continuation of disorders has demanded recourse to extreme measures. So many of the
factions that in the past have ranged themselves against the king have had no other source than excessive royal indulgence.
Finally, provided that one knows our history, one can not ignore this truth, for which I can produce testimony straight from
the mouths of our enemies....

In crimes against the state, it is necessary to close the door to, pity and scorn the complaints of involved parties,
and the cries of an ignorant multitude which sometimes finds fault with everything that is useful and even essential to its
well-being. Christians should forget personal offenses, but magistrates are obligated never to forget offenses committed
against the public interest. In fact, to let them go unpunished is not to pardon but rather like inviting the individuals to
commit the offense again.

There are many people whose ignorance is so immense that they feel it is sufficient to prohibit an evil to remedy
it; but they are wrong. I may say in truth that new laws are not as much a remedy for the disorders of states as testimo-
nies to their sickness, and symptoms of the weakness of the government. If the ancient laws had been well executed there
would be no need to renovate them or to enact new ones designed to prevent new disorders—which would never have taken
place had there existed a strong authority to punish the wrongs committed.

Ordinances and laws are quite useless if they are not followed by vigorous execution. This is so absolutely nec-
essary that while in the course of ordinary affairs justice requires an authentic proof, the same is not true for the state; in
such cases, what seems to be conjecture must sometimes be held as sufficiently clear; since the factions and conspiracies
which work against the public good are commonly carried on with so much skill and secrecy that there is seldom any proof
until after the event, when it is too late to remedy the situation. On such occasions, it is sometimes necessary to begin with
direct action and punishment; whereas in all others, as a preliminary to everything else, the facts must be proved by wit-
nesses or irreproachable documents. These maxims seem dangerous, and in fact they are not entirely devoid of peril, but
if extreme remedies are not used in the case of wrongs which can be verified only by conjecture, one can only attempt to
halt the course of a conspiracy by such innocuous means as the exile or imprisonment of suspected persons.

A man of good conscience and penetrating judicial mind, knowing the course of affairs and the future with almost
the same certainty as the present, will protect this practice from abuse. And, if worst comes to worst, the abuses commit-
ted are dangerous only to private individuals, which is not too important in comparison to the public interest. However, it
is necessary to exercise restraint in order not to open the door to tyranny by these means, which doubtless can be avoided
if, as I have said above, one only makes use of mild remedies in doubtful cases.

Punishment is so necessary in regard to the public interest that it is not even proper to compensate a present
wrong for a good service performed in the past, that is to say, to allow a crime to go unpunished because the one who com-
mittcd it had served well on another occasion. This is nevertheless what has been often practiced in this realm in the past.
Not only have minor wrongs been ignored in consideration of great services rendered, but great crimes have been ignored
for services of no importance, which is completely unacceptable. Good and bad are so different and contrary that they must
never be paralleled with one another; they are irreconcilable enemies—if one is worthy of recompense, the other is worthy of punishment, and both must be treated according to their merit. Even when one’s conscience could allow a worth-while deed to go without reward, and a notable crime to go unpunished, the needs of the state cannot permit it. Punishment and rewards aim at the future rather than the past;...

**THE POWER OF THE PRINCE**

The prince must be powerful to be respected by his subjects and by foreigners. Power being one of the most necessary things for the greatness of kings and for the prosperity of their governments, those who conduct the principal business of the state are especially obligated to omit nothing which may contribute to the authority of their master.

As goodness is the object of love, power is the cause of fear, and it is most certain that among all the pressures capable of moving a state, fear, grounded on esteem and reverence, has the power to make everyone perform his duty. If this principle is of great efficiency in respect to domestic affairs, it is not less so with respect to external matters. Subjects and foreigners look with the same eyes upon a redoubtable power, and will avoid offending a prince when they know he is in a position to do them harm if he is so inclined.

I have said that the basis of the power of which I speak must be esteem and respect. If such power is based on any other principle it is very dangerous; instead of creating a reasonable fear, it produces hatred for the prince-and princes are never in a worse condition than when they fall into public aversion.

Like a tree with different branches taking nourishment from the same root, the power which makes princes passionately hated or respected is of different kinds: the prince must be powerful through his reputation; and by maintaining a reasonably sized standing army; and by maintaining sufficient funds in his coffers to meet the unexpected emergencies which often occur when one least expects them. And, finally, the prince’s power stems from the possession of the hearts of his subjects, as will be clearly shown.

A good reputation is very necessary, for a prince held in high esteem can do more with his name alone than those princes with large armies but a bad reputation. A prince is obliged to be more concerned with the state of his reputation than with his own life, and must be willing to risk fortune and greatness rather than have his reputation tarnished in any way. It is certain that the first weakening of the reputation of a prince, however small it may be, is a dangerous step which may lead to his ruin.... History teaches that at all times and in all states princes with great reputations are happier than those who, lacking such an esteem, have surpassed them in strength, riches, and other forms of power.

Those who shape their conduct in accordance with the rules and principles contained in this testament, will doubtless acquire a valuable reputation.

**Questions:**
1. What role did the nobility play in Richelieu’s concept of the state?
2. By what means did he control their behavior and activities?
3. How would you compare Richelieu’s concepts of government to the ideas expressed by Machiavelli? Henry VIII? James I?
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15.2 The Sun King Shines

In the last years of Louis XIV (r. 1643–1715) at the splendid and magnificent palace of Versailles, the duke de Saint-Simon (1675–1755) began to compile notes describing the King and the royal court. Saint-Simon, a proud aristocrat of ancient lineage, was a gossipy and caustic observer.


He was a prince in whom no one would deny good and even great qualities but he had many others that were petty or downright bad, and of these it was impossible to determine which were natural and which acquired.... This is not the place to tell of his early childhood. He was king almost from birth, but was deliberately repressed by a mother who loved to govern, and still more so by a wicked and self-interested minister [Cardinal Mazarin], who risked the State a thousand times for his own aggrandizement. So long as that minister lived the King was held down, and that portion of his life should be subtracted from his reign.... After Mazarin’s death, he had enough intelligence to realize his deliverance, but not enough vigour to release himself. Indeed, that event was one of the finest moments of his life, for it taught him an unshakable principle namely, to banish all prime ministers and ecclesiastics from his councils. Another ideal, adopted at that time, he could never sustain because in the practice it constantly eluded him. This was to govern alone. It was the quality upon which he most prided himself and for which he received most praise and flattery. In fact, it was what he was least able to do.

Born with an intelligence rather below the average, his mind was very capable of development with training and education, for he could learn easily from others [without imitation]. He profited immensely from having always lived among people of the highest quality with the widest knowledge of life.... Indeed if I may say so of a King of twenty-three years old, he was fortunate in entering the world surrounded by brilliant people of every kind. His Ministers at home and abroad were the strongest in Europe, his generals the greatest, and all were men whose names have been handed down to posterity by common consent. The disturbances that rocked the very foundations of the State after the death of Louis XIII [the Fronde uprising] produced a Court full of famous men and polished courtiers.... [In the house of Mazarin’s niece] all the most distinguished men and women foregathered every day, making [it] the centre of the Court love-affairs, [and] the gallant intrigues and manoeuvres for ambition’s sake—schemes in which birth counted for much, for at that time rank was as much prized and respected as it is now despised. Into this brilliant vortex the King was first launched, and there he first acquired that polite, chivalrous manner which he retained all through his life and knew so well how to combine with stateliness and propriety.... Had he been born into private life, he would still have had a genius for entertainments, pleasures, and flirtations, and would have caused innumerable broken hearts.

Let me repeat. The King’s intelligence was below the average, but was very capable of improvement. He loved glory; he desired peace and good government. He was born prudent, temperate, secretive, master of his emotions and his tongue—can it be believed?—he was born good and just. God endowed him with all the makings of a good and perhaps even of a fairly great king. All the evil in him came from without. His early training was so dissolute... and he would sometimes speak bitterly of those [youthful] days.... He became very dependent on others, for they had scarcely taught him to read and write and he remained so ignorant that he learned nothing of historical events nor the facts about fortunes, careers, rank, or laws. This lack caused him sometimes, even in public to make many gross blunders.

You might imagine that as king he would have loved the old nobility and would not have cared to see it brought down to the level of other classes. Nothing was further from the truth. His aversion to noble sentiments and his partiality for his Ministers, who, to elevate themselves, hated and disparaged all who were what they themselves were not, nor ever could be, caused him to feel a similar antipathy for noble birth. He feared it as much as he feared intelligence, and if he found these two qualities united in one person, that man was finished.

His ministers, generals, mistresses, and courtiers learned soon after he became their master that glory, to him, was a foible rather than an ambition. They therefore flattered him to the top of his bent, and in so doing, spoiled him. Praise, or better, adulation, pleased him so much that the most fulsome was welcome and the most servile even more delectable. They were the only road to his favour and those whom he liked owed his friendship to choosing their moments well and never ceasing in their ambitions. That is what gave his ministers so much power, for they had endless opportunities of flattering his vanity, especially by suggesting that he was the source of all their ideas and had taught them all that they knew. Falseness, servility, admiring glances, combined with a dependent and cringing attitude, above all, an appearance of being nothing without him, were the only means of pleasing him.
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Flattery fed the desire for military glory that sometimes tore him from his loves, which was how Louvois so easily involved him in major wars and persuaded him that he was a better leader and strategist than any of his generals, a theory which those officers fostered in order to please him. All their praise he took with admirable complacency, and truly believed that he was what they said. Hence his liking for reviews, and his preference for sieges, where he could make cheap displays of courage, be forcibly restrained, and show his ability to endure fatigue and lack of sleep. He greatly enjoyed the sensation of being admired, as he rode along the lines, for his fine presence and princely bearing, his horsemanship, and other attainments.

Pride and vanity, which tend always to increase, and with which he was fed continually without even his perceiving it, even from preachers in the pulpits in his presence, were the foundations on which his ministers raised themselves above all other ranks. He was cunningly persuaded that their rank was merely an extension of his own, supreme in him, in them capable of increase (since without him they were nothing), and useful to him, because it gave them as his instruments greater dignity and made them more readily obeyed. That is why secretaries of state and ministers gradually left off their cloaks, then their bands, then their black gowns and simple seemly dress, and finally came to clothe themselves like gentlemen of quality. They then began to adopt the manners and later the privileges of the nobility, rising by stages to eat with the King, their wives assuming, as by right, the same prerogatives as their husbands, dining at the royal table, riding in the royal coaches, and in every way appearing equal to ladies of the highest rank.

Personal vanity of another kind led the King to encourage this behaviour. He was well aware that though he might crush a nobleman with the weight of his displeasure, he could not destroy him or his line, whereas a secretary of state or other such minister could be reduced together with his whole family to those depths of nothingness from which he had been elevated. No amount of wealth or possessions would avail him then. That was one reason why he liked to give his ministers authority over the highest in the land, even over the Princes of the Blood and all others who held no office under the crown, and to grant them rank and privileges to match. That is why any man of consequence who possessed anything which the King had no power either to destroy or maintain was carefully kept from the ministry; he would have been a source of danger and a continual anxiety.

Therein lay the reason for the watchful, jealous attitude of his ministers, who made it difficult for the King to hear any but themselves, although he pleased to think that he was easy for any man to approach. Indeed, he considered that it enhanced his majesty and the respect and fear with which he was regarded, and which he used to snub the most noble, that all men should have access to him only as he passed. Thus great lords and underlings alike might speak freely to him as he went from one room to another on his way to or from mass, or stepped into his coach. The more distinguished might wait at the door of his study, but none dared to follow him inside. In fact, approach to him was limited to those moments. Any matters whatsoever had to be explained to him in a few words, very awkwardly, and always within hearing range of his entourage, or, if one knew him well, one might whisper into his wig, which was scarcely more convenient. His almost invariable answer was, “We shall see” (Je verrai), very useful no doubt as a means of gaining time, but often bringing little comfort.

Private audiences in his study were rarely if ever granted, even when the matter concerned State affairs. Never, for example, to envoys returning or going abroad, never to generals, unless in extraordinary circumstances, and private letters written to the King always passed through the hands of some minister, except on one or two most rare and special occasions.

Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that the King had been so spoiled with false notions of majesty and power, that every other thought was stifled in him, there was much to be gained from a private audience, if it might be obtained, and if one knew how to conduct oneself with all the respect due to his dignity and habits. I, indeed, can speak from experience.

Once in his study, however prejudiced he might be, however much displeased, he would listen patiently, good-naturedly, and with a real desire to be informed. You could see that he had a sense of justice and a will to get at the truth, even though he might feel vexed with you, and that quality he retained all through his life. In private audience you could say anything to him, provided, as I have already remarked, that you said it respectfully, with submissiveness and proper deference, for without that you would have been in a worse plight. With the proper manner, however, you could interrupt him when it was your turn to speak, and bluntly deny his accusations, you could even raise your voice above his without vexing him, and he would congratulate himself on the audience and praise the person he interviewed for ridding him of prejudices and the lies he had been told; moreover, he would prove his sincerity by his subsequent attitude.

It is therefore enough to make one weep to think of the wickedness of an education designed solely to suppress the virtue and intelligence of that prince, and the insidious poison of barefaced flattery which made him a kind of god in the very heart of Christendom. His ministers with their cruel politics hemmed him in and made him drunk with power until he was utterly corrupted. If they did not manage entirely to smother such kindness, justice, and love of truth as God had given him, they blunted and obstructed those virtues to the lasting injury of himself and his kingdom.
From such alien and pernicious sources he acquired a pride so colossal that, truly, had not God implanted in his heart the fear of the devil, even in his worst excesses, he would literally have allowed himself to be worshipped. What is more, he would have found worshippers... From this false pride stemmed all that ruined him.

The Court was yet another device to sustain the King’s policy of despotism. Many things combined to remove it from Paris and keep it perpetually in the country. The disorders of the minority had been staged mainly in that city and for that reason the King had taken a great aversion to it and had become convinced that it was dangerous to live there.

The awkward situation of his mistresses and the dangers involved in conducting such scandalous affairs in a busy capital, crowded with people of every kind of mentality, played no small part in deciding him to leave, for he was embarrassed by the crowds whenever he went in or out or appeared upon the streets. Other reasons for departure were his love of hunting and the open air, so much more easily indulged in the country than in Paris, which is far from forests and ill-supplied with pleasant walks, and his delight in building, a later and ever-increasing passion, which could not be enjoyed in the town, where he was continually in the public eye. Finally, he conceived the idea that he would be all the more venerated by the multitude if he lived retired and were no longer seen every day.... It was then that he first began to attract society to him with fares and diversions and to let it be known that he wished often to be visited....

The frequent entertainments, the private drives to Versailles, and the royal journeys, provided the King with a means of distinguishing or mortifying his courtiers by naming those who were or were not to accompany him, and thus keeping everyone eager and anxious to please him. He fully realized that the substantial gifts which he had to offer were too few to have any continuous effect, and he substituted imaginary favours that appealed to men’s jealous natures, small distinctions which he was able, with extraordinary ingenuity, to grant or withhold every day and almost every hour. The hopes that courtiers built upon such flimsy favours and the importance which they attached to them were really unbelievable, and no one was ever more artful than the King in devising fresh occasions for them.

But there would be no end to describing all the different expedients that followed one after another as the King grew older and the entertainments increased or diminished in number, or to telling of the methods he employed to keep so large a Court always about him.

He not only required the constant attendance of the great, but was also aware of those of lower rank. He would look about him at his letier and coucher, at meals, and while walking through the state apartments or the Versailles gardens, where none but courtiers might follow him. He saw and noticed every one of them, marked very well the absences of those usually at Court and even of those who attended more rarely, and took care to discover the reason, drawing his own conclusions and losing no opportunity of acting upon them. He took it as an offence if distinguished people did not make the Court their home, or if others came but seldom. And to come never, or scarcely ever, meant certain disgrace.

Louis XIV took enormous pains to be well-informed about all that went on in public places, in private houses, society, family business, or the progress of love-affairs. He had spies and reporters everywhere and of all descriptions. Many of them never realized that their reports reached the King, others wrote directly to him, sending their letters by secret channels of his own devising. Their letters were seen by him alone and he always read them before proceeding to other business. There were even some who spoke privately with him in his study, entering by the back way. Through such secret informants, an immense number of people of all ranks were broken, often most unjustly, and without their ever discovering the reason, for the King, once suspicious, never trusted again, or so rarely that it made no matter....

No other King has ever approached him for the number and quality of his stables and hunting establishments. Who could count his buildings? Who not deplore their ostentation, whimsicality and bad taste?

... He was entirely ruled by [his ministers], even by the youngest and most mediocre, even by those whom he liked and trusted least. Always, he was on guard against influences, and always believed that he had been completely successful in avoiding them.

Questions:
1. How fairly did Saint-Simon evaluate Louis XIV and the Sun King’s court?
2. How did Louis’s vanity influence royal policy?
3. In what ways was Louis XIV isolated from reality?
4. How did Louis control the ambitions of the French nobility? How did his methods compare to those of Richelieu?
15.3 Louis XIV: Mémoires for the Instruction of the Dauphin

Louis XIV’s (1638–1715) view of kingship was influenced by his experience of the Fronde during his minority. The supporters of the Fronde led armed uprisings as part of their effort to limit royal authority. When the Fronde was defeated and Louis reached his majority, he committed himself to making the absolute power of the monarchy a reality.


I would not speak to you in this way, my son, if I had seen in you the least tendency toward cruelty, for a bloody and ferocious temper is despicable in a man, and beneath the dignity of a king. On the contrary, I will endeavor to acquaint you with the charm of clemency, the most regal of all virtues since it can only belong to kings; for clemency is one duty for which we can never be repaid.

Whoever pardons too often punishes uselessly the rest of time, for in the terror which restrains men from evil, the hope of pardon lessens the effect of pardon itself. You will not finish the reading of these Mémoires, my son, without finding places where I have conquered myself and pardoned offenses that I could justly never forget. But on that occasion when it was a question of state, of the most pernicious examples, and of the most contagious disorder for all my subjects, of a revolt that attacked the very foundations of my authority, I knew that I should overcome my scruples and punish these scoundrels rather than pardoning them.

Whoever is poorly informed cannot avoid poor thinking; and if you search past centuries for all the errors attributed to sovereigns, hardly one can be excused for not knowing something that he should have known, for so it is generally among men that one says “I did not know,” or “I did not think.”

Frequently after finishing an affair we learn something new and lament that if only we had known this sooner we would have acted differently; in short I believe if a man is fully informed he will always do what he should. Thus it is necessary that a sovereign take the greatest care to be informed of his own times.

But for me, I extended this reflection, for I was convinced that it was not enough to be informed of current affairs but also of ancient times. I consider that a knowledge of these great events, assimilated by a mature mind, can serve to fortify one’s reasoning in all important deliberations; for the example of illustrious men and their unique deeds provides very useful perspectives for war and peace, so that a naturally great and generous soul, contemplating these actions, would be inspired by them and ensure that the lessons of history can inspire others as well.

I have heard it said that all the great heroes of the past were conversant with literature and that part of their greatness was due to their literary study. Particularly I found the study of the past to be very useful in becoming wise in the art of war.

But kings must learn not to permit their servants to become too powerful because, if they are promoted too quickly, they are obliged to constantly support them or painfully suffer them; usually only weak or clumsy princes tolerate these monstrous promotions.

I am not saying that we should not for our own interest and grandeur wish that our greatness is shared by those in our good graces, but we must carefully guard against their excess. My advice to guarantee this consists of three principal observations.

The first is that you know your affairs completely, because a king who does not know them is always dependent on those who serve him and cannot defend himself from their wiles.

The second, that you divide your confidence among many, so that each of those you have entrusted will check the elevation of his rival, ensuring that the jealousy of one will bridle the ambition of the other.
And the third, that even though you admit a small number of persons into your secret affairs or into your casual conversations, never permit anyone to imagine that they have the power to speak as they please of their good or bad impressions of the others; but, on the contrary, you must expressly maintain a type of association with all who hold important state posts, and give to everyone the same liberty to propose whatever they believe for your service; so that none of them would believe that they could not turn to you for their needs and they think only of your good graces; and lastly the most distant and the most familiar should be persuaded that they are totally dependent upon you.

But you should know that this independence upon which I insist so strongly raises more than anything the authority of the master, and that it alone shows that he is governing them instead of being governed by them: As to the contrary when it ceases, invariably intrigues, liaisons, and cabals enlarge the power of the court and weaken the reputation of the prince.

**Question:**
1. Why did Louis XIV believe his son should study history?
I made a point of impressing upon my men the necessity of attention to orders, and of prompt obedience in carrying out any manoeuvres during the action with courage and in good order. I assured them that herein lay our safety and, perhaps, victory.

I had scarcely finished speaking when the enemy’s battery opened fire upon us, and raked us through and through. They concentrated their fire upon us, and with their first discharge carried off Count de la Bastide, the lieutenant of my own company with whom at the moment I was speaking, and twelve grenadiers, who fell side by side in the ranks, so that my coat was covered with brains and blood. So accurate was the fire that each discharge of the cannon stretched some of my men on the ground. I suffered agonies at seeing these brave fellows perish without a chance of defending themselves, but it was absolutely necessary that they should not move from their post.

This cannonade was but the prelude of the attack that the enemy were developing, and I looked upon the moment when they would fling themselves against one point or another in our entrenchments as so instant that I would allow no man even to bow his head before the storm, fearing that the regiment would find itself in disorder when the time came for us to make the rapid movement that would be demanded of us. At last the enemy’s army began to move to the assault, and still it was necessary for me to suffer this sacrifice to avoid a still greater misfortune, though I had five officers and eighty grenadiers killed on the spot before we had fired a single shot.

So steep was the slope in front of us that as soon almost as the enemy’s column began its advance it was lost in view, and it came into sight only two hundred paces from our entrenchments. I noticed that it kept as far as possible from the glacis of the town and close alongside of the wood, but I could not make out whether a portion might not also be marching within the latter with the purpose of attacking that part of our entrenchments facing it, and the uncertainty caused me to delay movement. There was nothing to lead me to suppose that the enemy had such an intimate knowledge of our defences as to guide them to one point in preference to another for their attack.

Had I been able to guess that the column was being led by that scoundrel of a corporal who had betrayed us, I should not have been in this dilemma, nor should I have thought it necessary to keep so many brave men exposed to the perils of the cannonade, but my doubts came to an end two hours after midday, for I caught sight of the tips of the Imperial standards, and no longer hesitated. I changed front as promptly as possible, in order to bring my grenadiers opposite the part of our position adjoining the wood, towards which I saw that the enemy was directing its advance.

The regiment now left a position awkward in the extreme on account of the cannon, but we soon found ourselves scarcely better off, for hardly had our men lined the little parapet when the enemy broke into the charge, and rushed at full speed, shouting at the top of their voices, to throw themselves into our entrenchments.

The rapidity of their movements, together with their loud yells, were truly alarming, and as soon as I heard them I ordered our drums to beat the ‘charge’ so as to drown them with their noise, lest they should have a bad effect upon our people. By this means I animated my grenadiers, and prevented them hearing the shouts of the enemy, which before now have produced a heedless panic.

The English infantry led this attack with the greatest intrepidity, right up to our parapet, but there they were opposed with a courage at least equal to their own. Rage, fury, and desperation were manifested by both sides, with the more obstinacy as the assailants and assailed were perhaps the bravest soldiers in the world. The little parapet which separated the two forces became the scene of the bloodiest struggle that could be conceived. Thirteen hundred grenadiers, of whom seven hundred belonged to the Elector’s Guards, and six hundred who were left under my command, bore the brunt of the enemy’s attack at the forefront of the Bavarian infantry.

It would be impossible to describe in words strong enough the details of the carnage that took place during this first attack, which lasted a good hour or more. We were all fighting hand to hand, hurling them back as they clutched at the parapet; men were slaying, or tearing at the muzzles of guns and the bayonets which pierced their entrails; crushing under their feet their own wounded comrades, and even gouging out their opponents’ eyes with their nails, when the grip was so close that neither could make use of their weapons. I verily believe that it would have been quite impossible to find a more terrible representation of Hell itself than was shown in the savagery of both sides on this occasion.
At last the enemy, after losing more than eight thousand men in this first onslaught, were obliged to relax their hold, and they fell back for shelter to the dip in the slope, where we could not harm them. A sudden calm now reigned amongst us, our people were recovering their breath, and seemed more determined even than they were before the conflict. The ground around our parapet was covered with dead and dying, in heaps almost as high as our fascines, but our whole attention was fixed on the enemy and his movements; we noticed that the tops of his standards still showed at about the same place as that from which they had made their charge in the first instance, leaving little doubt but that they were reforming before returning to the assault. As soon as possible we set vigorously to work to render their approach more difficult for them than before, and by means of an increasing fire swept their line of advance with a torrent of bullets, accompanied by numberless grenades, of which we had several wagon loads in rear of our position. These, owing to the slope of the ground, fell right amongst the enemy’s ranks, causing them great annoyance and doubtless added not a little to their hesitation in advancing the second time to the attack. They were so disheartened by the first attempt that their generals had the greatest difficulty in bringing them forward again, and indeed would never have succeeded in this, though they tried every other means, had they not dismounted and set an example by placing themselves at the head of the column, and leading them on foot.

Their devotion cost them dear, for General Stirum and many other generals and officers were killed. They once more, then, advanced to the assault, but with nothing like the success of their first effort, for not only did they lack energy in their attack, but after being vigorously repulsed, were pursued by us at the point of the bayonet for more than eighty paces beyond our entrenchments, which we finally re-entered unmolested.

After this second attempt many efforts were made by their generals, but they were never able to bring their men to the assault a third time . . .

But I noticed all at once an extraordinary movement on the part of our infantry, who were rising up and ceasing fire withal. I glanced around on all sides to see what had caused this behaviour, and then became aware of several lines of infantry in greyish white uniforms on our left flank. From lack of movement on their part, their dress and bearing, I verily believed that reinforcements had arrived for us, and anybody else would have believed the same. No information whatever had reached us of the enemy’s success, or even that such a thing was the least likely, so in the error I laboured under I shouted to my men that they were Frenchman, and friends, and they at once resumed their former position behind the parapet.

Having, however, made a closer inspection, I discovered bunches of straw and leaves attached to their standards, badges the enemy are in the custom of wearing on the occasion of battle, and at that very moment was struck by a ball in the right lower jaw, which wounded and stupefied me to such an extent that I thought it was smashed. I probed my wound as quickly as possible with the tip of my finger, and finding the jaw itself entire, did not make much fuss about it; but the front of my jacket was so deluged with the blood which poured from it that several of our officers believed that I was dangerously hurt. I reassured them, however, and exhorted them to stand firmly with their men. I pointed out to them that so long as our infantry kept well together the danger was not so great, and that if they behaved in a resolute manner, the enemy, who were only keeping in touch with us without daring to attack us, would allow us to retire without so much as pursuing. In truth, to look at them it would seem that they hoped much more for our retreat than any chance of coming to blows with us. I at once, therefore, shouted as loudly as I could that no one was to quit the ranks, and then formed my men in column along the entrenchments facing the wood, fronting towards the opposite flank, which was the direction in which we should have to retire. Thus, whenever I wished to make a stand, I had but to turn my men about, and at any moment could resume the retirement instantaneously, which we thus carried out in good order. I kept this up until we had crossed the entrenchments on the other flank, and then we found ourselves free from attack. This retreat was not made, however, without loss, for the enemy, although they would not close with us when they saw our column formed for the retirement, fired volleys at close range into us, which did much damage.

My men had no sooner got clear of the entrenchments than they found that the slope was in their favour, and they fairly broke their ranks and took to flight, in order to reach the plain that lay before them before the enemy’s cavalry could get upon their track. As each ran his hardest, intending to reform on the further side, they disappeared like a flash of lightning without ever looking back, and I, who was with the rearguard ready to make a stand if necessary against our opponents, had scarcely clambered over the entrenchments when I found myself left entirely alone on the height, prevented from running by my heavy boots.

I looked about on all sides for my drummer, whom I had warned to keep at hand with my horse, but he had evidently thought fit to look after himself, with the result that I found myself left solitary to the mercy of the enemy and my own sad thoughts, without the slightest idea as to my future fate. I cudgelled my brains in vain for some way out of my difficulty, but could think of nothing the least certain; the plain was too wide for me to traverse in my big boots at the necessary speed, and to crown my misfortunes, was covered with cornfields. So far the enemy’s cavalry had not appeared on the plain, but there was every reason to believe that they would not long delay their coming; it would have been utter folly on my part to give them the chance of discovering me embarrassed as I was, for as long as I was hampered with my boots, a trooper would always find it an easy affair to catch me.
I noticed, however, that the Danube was not so very far away, and determined to make my way towards it at all risk, with the hope of finding some beaten track or place where there would be some chance of saving my life, as I saw it was now hopeless to think of getting my men together. As a matter of fact, I found a convenient path along the bank of the river, but this was not of much avail to me, for, owing to my efforts and struggles to reach it through several fields of standing corn, I was quite blown and exhausted and could only just crawl along at the slowest possible pace. On my way I met the wife of a Bavarian soldier, so distracted with weeping that she travelled no faster than I did. I made her drag off my boots, which fitted me so tightly about the legs that it was absolutely impossible for me to do this for myself. The poor woman took an immense time to effect this, and it seemed to me at least as if the operation would never come to an end. At last this was effected, and I turned over in my mind the best way to profit by my release, when, raising my head above the corn at the side of the road, I saw a number of the enemy’s troopers scattered over the country, searching the fields for any of our people who might be hidden therein, with the intention, doubtless, of killing them for the sake of what plunder might be found upon them. At this cruel prospect all my hopes vanished, and the exultation I felt at my release from the boots died at the moment of its birth. My position was now more perilous than ever; nevertheless, I examined under the cover afforded by the corn the manoeuvres of these cavaliers to see if I could not find some way out of the difficulty. A notion came into my head which, if it could have been carried out, might have had a curious ending. It was that if one trooper only should approach me, and his comrades remained sufficiently distant, I should keep hidden and wait until he got near enough for me to kill him with a shot from my pistol, for I had two on my belt; I would then take his uniform, mount his horse, and make my escape in this disguise, a plan which would be favoured by the approaching darkness. But not seeing any chance of being able to carry out this idea, I thought of another, namely, to get into the river up to my chin in the water under the bushes on the bank, wait for nightfall and the return of the troopers to their camp, and then to escape in the dark. But there were more difficulties to contend with in risking this even than in the other case, and as a last resource it struck me that if I might save myself by crossing the river, for happily I knew how to swim, although the risk here was very great owing to the breadth and rapidity of the Danube. I hurriedly determined on this plan, as I now saw a number of troopers approaching ever nearer to my hiding place, who were refusing to give quarter to the unhappy wounded they found hidden in the corn, whom they ruthlessly despatched the more easily to despoil them. There was no reason to suppose that they were likely to show any more mercy to me, particularly as I was worth more in the shape of plunder than a private soldier, nor was there time to lose in making up my mind, so I then and there determined to swim the river. Before taking to the water I took the precaution of leaving on the bank my richly embroidered uniform, rather spoiled as it was by the events of the late action. I scattered in a similar manner my hat, wig, pistols, and sword, at one point and another, so that if the troopers came up before I had got well away, they would devote their attention to collecting these articles instead of looking in the water, and it turned out just as I thought. I kept on my stockings, vest, and breeches, simply buttoning the sleeves of the vest and tucking the pockets within my breeches for safety; this done, I threw myself upon the mercy of the stream. I had hardly got any distance when up came the troopers, who, as I had hoped, dismounted as quickly as they could to lay hands on the spoil lying before them; they even set to work to quarrel over it, for I distinctly heard them shouting and swearing in the most delightful manner. Others apparently got no share, and they amused themselves by saluting me with several musket shots, but the current of the river which carried me on my way soon put me out of their range. Finally, after a very long and hard swim, I was lucky enough to reach the other bank, in spite of the strength of the stream.

Question:
1. What does the nature of this conflict tell us about the importance of the fight for both sides?
15.5 G. M. Trevelyan: Chapter I from *History of England*

The historian G. M. Trevelyan (1876–1962) stressed the importance of the historian’s use of speculative imagination, the effort to bring the past to life through compelling storytelling based on all available evidence. The excerpt of his work included here comes from his one volume *History of England* (1926). It deals the development of the British political tradition over the course of the eighteenth century.


The coming over of William of Orange had confirmed the doctrine of the Whigs and confused that of the Tories, but it gave the Whigs no mechanical advantage over their rivals. Throughout the reigns of William and Anne the two parties continued to share power evenly; the Crown and the electorate favored first one side and then the other, according to the circumstances of the hour; the party contest continued to be vigorous, sometimes to fierceness, and in the main fortunate in its outcome for the country’s interests. It is only in the reigns of George I and II that we find a state of things that may, with reserves and explanations, be picturesquely described as a ‘Whig oligarchy.’ Nor would it have come into existence even then, if half the Tory party had not been so gravely compromised with Jacobitism.

Partly for this reason, partly because George I was ignorant of English language and customs, the first two Hanoverians abandoned to the Whig leaders certain prerogatives of the Crown which William III and even Anne would never have let out of their own hands. The formation of Ministries, the dissolution of Parliament, the patronage of the Crown in Church and State, all passed, in effect, from the monarch to the Whig chiefs. In that sense a political oligarchy was indeed established after 1714. But in another aspect the change was a further development of the popular element in our constitution, by the establishment of the omnipotence of Ministries dependent on the vote of the House of Commons, and by the reduction of the power wielded by the hereditary monarch.

1760–1780

Later on, George III attempted in the first twenty years of his reign to take back the patronage of the Crown into the royal hands, in consonance with the undoubted intentions of those who made the Revolution Settlement. But as soon as he had recovered the patronage of the Crown, he used it to corrupt the House of Commons even more systematically than Walpole and the Whig oligarchs had done. Neither the Whig oligarchs nor George III ever tried to stand on the unparliamentary ground of the Stuarts. They never ventured to deny that the executive could only exercise power in agreement with a majority of the House of Commons. But it was possible in the Eighteenth Century to corrupt the members through the distribution of patronage, because the rotten boroughs were becoming less representative of the country with every year that passed.

Under the first two Georges the power of the House of Commons increased, while its connection with the people diminished. The long hibernation of the Tory party and the deadness of all serious political controversy damped public interest in parliamentary affairs, other than the distribution of places and bribes. The Septennial Act, passed in 1716 to secure the House of Hanover against Jacobite reaction, prolonged the normal life of a Parliament; by rendering political tenures more secure, it further deadened political interest in the country and increased the readiness of members to enter the pay of government.

Under George III there was a great revival of public interest in politics, but no increase in democratic control over Parliament. But when, by the Reform Bill of 1832, the middle class recovered more than their old power over the House of Commons, they found in the modern machinery of Parliament and Cabinet a far more effective instrument of government than any which had existed in Stuart times. The Parliamentary aristocracy of the Eighteenth Century had forged and sharpened the future weapons of the democracy. It is doubtful whether nobles and squires would ever have consented to concentrate such powers in the Lower House, if they had thought of it as a strictly popular body. But they thought of it as a house of gentlemen, many of them nominees or relations of the Peerage, as the ‘best club in London,’ as the ‘Roman Senate’ to which the highest interests of the country could safely be committed.

Under these conditions, the aristocratic Eighteenth Century made a great contribution of its own to the growth of British political tradition. The aristocrats devised the machinery by which the legislature could control the executive without hampering its efficiency. This machinery is the Cabinet system and the office of Prime Minister. By the Cabinet system we mean in England a group of Ministers dependent on the favour of the House of Commons and all having seats in Parliament, who must agree on a common policy and who are responsible for one another’s action and for the government of the country as a whole. Neither Prime Minister nor Cabinet system was contemplated in the Revolution Settlement. They grew up gradually to meet the country’s needs in peace and in war. The first approach to a united Cabinet was made by William III merely to fight the war against Louis, but he remained his own Prime Minister and his own Foreign Minister.
In Anne’s reign Marlborough acted as the head of the State in war time for all military and diplomatic affairs, but he left to his colleagues the management of Parliament. It was Sir Robert Walpole, the Whig peace Minister from 1721 to 1742, who did most to evolve the principle of the common responsibility of the Cabinet, and the supremacy of the Prime Minister as the leading man at once in the Cabinet and in the Commons. It was significant that, unlike his Whig and Tory predecessors in power, Sir Robert remained un dazzled by the lure of peerage, and refused to leave the Lower House so long as he aspired to govern the country. When he consented to become Earl of Orford he was retiring for ever from office.

In effecting these changes in the custom of the constitution, Walpole acted not a little from love of personal power, but he did the country a great service. In driving out from his Cabinet all colleagues who did not agree with his policy or would not submit to his leadership as Premier, he set up the machinery by which Britain has since been ruled in peace and war. The Cabinet system is the key by which the English were able to get efficient government by a responsible and united executive, in spite of the fact that the executive was subject to the will of a debating assembly of five or six hundred men. They solved this problem, which many nations have found insoluble, not, as was often contemplated in William III’s reign, by excluding the Ministers from the Commons, but on the contrary by insisting that they should sit in and lead the House of Commons, like Sir Robert Walpole. The Cabinet is the link between the executive and legislative, and it is a very close link indeed. It is the essential part of the modern British polity.1

It was well for England that the Revolution Settlement did not supply her with a brand-new, water-tight, unalterable, written constitution. A sacrosanct written constitution was necessary to achieve the federal union of the States of North America after they had cut themselves adrift from the old Empire. For England it was not at all necessary, and it would certainly have proved inconvenient. If England had been given a rigid constitution when James II was deposed, the Crown would have had assigned to it, in perpetuity, powers which within thirty years of the coronation of William and Mary it handed over to be exercised by its Parliamentary advisers. It is probable, also, that a rigid constitution, drawn up according to the lights of 1689, would have excluded the King’s Ministers from sitting in the House of Commons.

A written constitution, as distinct from the sum of ordinary law and custom, is alien to the English political genius. One of the worst signs of the straits to which Cromwell was driven by his inability to find a basis of national agreement, was the fact that he promulgated written constitutions dividing up by an absolute line—never to be altered—the powers of Protector and Parliament respectively. These expedients were contrary to the real method of English progress. The London fog which decently conceals from view the exact relations of executive and legislative at Westminster, has enabled the constitution to adapt itself unobserved to the requirements of each passing age.

1714–1760

When we speak of the Whig oligarchy under the first two Georges, we mean (so far as we mean anything definite) about seventy great families, who, in alliance or in rivalry among themselves, exercised the power and patronage of the State, on condition of retaining the constant support of the House of Commons. The heads of the great Whig families mostly sat among the Peers, and their cadets in the Commons. The Peers were able to keep the confidence of the Lower House, partly because they never seriously opposed themselves to its political ideas, and partly because they owned many of the rotten boroughs that returned so many of its members. These great noblemen had therefore no temptation to set up the claims of the more dignified but less powerful chamber in which they themselves sat. The Peers were unofficially but very effectually represented in the House of Commons, and had no objection to the constant increase of its power.

It was not until the Nineteenth Century, during and after the Reform Bill of 1832, that the Peers thought it necessary to assert the direct power of their own chamber. It was only then that they had cause to question the prescriptive right of the House of Commons to legislate at will for the nation. But in the Nineteenth Century such resistance, though by no means wholly ineffectual, came in the main too late. Englishmen had been so long accustomed to be ruled by the House of Commons when it was an aristocratic assembly, that they would not allow its power to be curtailed when it began to be more truly representative of the nation at large.

Question:
1. How does Trevelyan represent Walpole?

---

1 The English in those days were better politicians than political theorists. They permitted the French philosopher, Montesquieu, to report to the world in his *Esprit des Lois* (1748) that the secret of British freedom was the separation of executive and legislative, whereas the opposite was much nearer to the truth. Partly on account of Montesquieu’s error, confirmed by Blackstone, partly for better local reasons, the Federal Constitution of the United States was drawn up on the idea of separating executive from legislative.
15.6 Peter the Great: Correspondence with His Son

Peter the Great (1672–1725) hoped to westernize Russia and make his nation a great power in Europe. To this end, he promulgated a wide variety of reforms and involved Russia in numerous wars. Discontent with his policies led some in Russia to look to his son Alexei for leadership. Alexei was eventually tried and executed for treason.


A LETTER TO ALEXEI

October 11, 1715
Declaration to My Son,

You cannot be ignorant of what is known to all the world, to what degree our people groaned under the oppression of the Swedes before the beginning of the present war.

By the usurpation of so many maritime places so necessary to our state, they had cut us off from all commerce with the rest of the world, and we saw with regret that besides they had cast a thick veil before the eyes of the clear-sighted. You know what it has cost us in the beginning of this war (in which God alone has led us, as it were, by the hand. and still guides us) to make ourselves experienced in the art of war, and to put a stop to those advantages which our implacable enemies obtained over us.

We submitted to this with a resignation to the will of God, making no doubt but it was he who put us to that trial, till he might lead us into the right way, and we might render ourselves worthy to experience, that the same enemy who at first made others tremble, now in his turn trembles before us, perhaps in a much greater degree. These are the fruits which, next to the assistance of God, we owe to our own toil and to the labour of our faithful and affectionate children, our Russian subjects.

But at the time that I am viewing the prosperity which God has heaped on our native country, if I cast an eye upon the posterity that is to succeed me, my heart is much more penetrated with grief on account of what is to happen, then I rejoice at those blessings that are past, seeing that you, my son, reject all means of making yourself capable of well-governing after me. I say your incapacity is voluntary. because you cannot excuse yourself with want of natural parts and strength of body, as if God had not given you a sufficient share of either: and though your constitution is none of the strongest, yet it cannot be said that it is altogether weak.

But you even will not so much as hear warlike exercises mentioned; though it is by them that we broke through that obscurity in which we were involved, and that we made ourselves known to nations, whose esteem we share at present.

But at the time that I am viewing the prosperity which God has heaped on our native country, if I cast an eye upon the posterity that is to succeed me, my heart is much more penetrated with grief on account of what is to happen, then I rejoice at those blessings that are past, seeing that you, my son, reject all means of making yourself capable of well-governing after me. I say your incapacity is voluntary. because you cannot excuse yourself with want of natural parts and strength of body, as if God had not given you a sufficient share of either: and though your constitution is none of the strongest, yet it cannot be said that it is altogether weak.

But you even will not so much as hear warlike exercises mentioned; though it is by them that we broke through that obscurity in which we were involved, and that we made ourselves known to nations, whose esteem we share at present.

I do not exhort you to make war without lawful reasons: I only desire you to apply yourself to learn the art of it: for it is impossible well to govern without knowing the rules and discipline of it, was it for no other end than for the defense of the country.

I could place before your eyes many instances of what I am proposing to you. I will only mention to you the Greeks, with whom we are united by the same profession of faith. What occasioned their decay but that they neglected arms? Idleness and repose weakened them, made them submit to tyrants, and brought them to that slavery to which they are now so long since reduced. You mistake, if you think it is enough for a prince to have good generals to act under his order. Everyone looks upon the head; they study his inclinations and conform themselves to them: all the world owns this. My brother during his reign loved magnificence in dress, and great equipages of horses. The nation were not much inclined that way, but the prince’s delight soon became that of his subjects. for they are inclined to imitate him in liking a thing as well as disliking it.

If the people so easily break themselves of things which only regard pleasure, will they not forget in time, or will they not more easily give over the practice of arms, the exercise of which is the more painful to them, the less they are kept to it?

You have no inclination to learn war, you do not apply yourself to it, and consequently you will never learn it: And how then can you command others, and judge of the reward which those deserve who do their duty, or punish others who fail of it? You will do nothing, nor judge of anything but by the eyes and help of others. like a young bird that holds up his bill to be fed.
You say that the weak state of your health will not permit you to undergo the fatigues of war: This is an excuse which is no better than the rest. I desire no fatigues, but only inclination, which even sickness itself cannot hinder. Ask those who remember the time of my brother. He was of a constitution weaker by far than yours. He was not able to manage a horse of the least mettle, not could he hardly mount it: Yet he loved horses. hence it came, that there never was, nor perhaps is there actually now in the nation a finer stable than his was.

By this you see that good success does not always depend on pain, but on the will.

If you think there are some, whose affairs do not fail of success, though they do not go to war themselves; it is true: But if they do not go themselves, yet they have an inclination for it, and understand it.

For instance, the late King of France did not always take the field in person; but it is known to what degree he loved war, and what glorious exploits he performed in it, which made his campaigns to be called the theatre and school of the world. His inclinations were not confined solely to military affairs, he also loved mechanics, manufactures and other establishments, which rendered his kingdom more flourishing than any other whatsoever.

After having made to you all those remonstrances, I return to my former subject which regards you.

I am a man and consequently I must die. To whom shall I leave after me to finish what by the grace of God I have begun, and to preserve what I have partly recovered? To a man, who like the slothful servant hides his talent in the earth, that is to say, who neglects making the best of what God has entrusted to him?

Remember your obstinacy and ill-nature, how often I reproached you with it, and even chastised you for it, and for how many years I almost have not spoke to you; but all this has availed nothing, has effected nothing. It was but losing my time: it was striking the air. You do not make the least endeavors. and all your pleasure seems to consist in staying idle and lazy at home: Things of which you ought to be ashamed (forasmuch as they make you miserable) seem to make up your dearest delight, nor do you foresee the dangerous consequences of it for yourself and for the whole state. St. Paul has left us a great truth when he wrote: If a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take of the church of God?

After having considered all those great inconveniences and reflected upon them, and seeing I cannot bring you to good by any inducement, I have thought fit to give you in writing this act of my last will, with this resolution however to wait still a little longer before I put it in execution to see if you will mend. If not, I will have you to know that I will deprive you of the succession, as one may cut off a useless member.

Do not fancy, that, because I have no other child but you, I only write this to terrify you. I will certainly put it in execution, if it please God; for whereas I do not spare my own life for my country and the welfare of my people, why should I spare you who do not render yourself worthy of either? I would rather choose to transmit them to a worthy stranger, than to my own unworthy son.

Peter

ALEXEI’S REPLY

Most Clement Lord and Father,

I have read the paper your Majesty gave me on the 27th of October, 1715, after the funeral of my late consort. I have nothing to reply to it, but, that if your Majesty will deprive me of the succession to the Crown of Russia by reason of my incapacity, your will be done; I even most instantly beg it of you, because I do not think myself fit for the government. My memory is very much weakened, and yet it is necessary in affairs. The strength of my mind and of my body is much decayed by the sicknesses which I have undergone, and which have rendered me incapable of governing so many nations; this requires a more vigorous man than I am.

Therefore I do not aspire after you (whom God preserve many years) to the succession of the Russian Crown, even if I had no brother as I have one at present, whom I pray God preserve. Neither will I pretend for the future to that succession, of which I take God to witness, and swear it upon my soul, in testimony whereof I write and sign this present with my own hand.

I put my children into your hands, and as for myself, I desire nothing of you but a bare maintenance during my life, leaving the whole to your consideration and to your will.

Your most humble servant and son.

Alexei

Question:
1. What does Peter’s letter to Alexei reveal about Peter’s attitude toward war and his views on Alexei’s right of succession?
16.1 Tortured Execution vs. Prison Rules

TORTURE

This selection from 1757 tells in very graphic detail of a public execution and the torture that accompanied it. The person executed was named Damien, accused of attempting regicide (killing of the king). Ménétra (Document 18.4) mentions this crime.


On 2 March 1757 Damiens the regicide was condemned 'to make the amende honorable before the main door of the Church of Paris', where he was to be 'taken and conveyed in a cart, wearing nothing but a shirt, holding a torch of burning wax weighing two pounds'; then, 'in the said cart, to the Place de Grève, where, on a scaffold that will be erected there, the flesh will be torn from his breasts, arms, thighs and calves with red-hot pincers, his right hand, holding the knife with which he committed the said parricide, burnt with sulphur, and, on those places where the flesh will be torn away, poured molten lead, boiling oil, burning resin, wax and sulphur melted together and then his body drawn and quartered by four horses and his limbs and body consumed by fire, reduced to ashes and his ashes thrown to the winds.'

'Finally, he was quartered,' recounts the Gazette d’Amsterdam of 1 April 1757. 'This last operation was very long, because the horses used were not accustomed to drawing; consequently, instead of four, six were needed; and when that did not suffice, they were forced, in order to cut off the wretch's thighs, to sever the sinews and hack at the joints..."

'It is said that, though he was always a great swearer, no blasphemy escaped his lips; but the excessive pain made him utter horrible cries, and he often repeated: “My God, have pity on me! Jesus, help me!” The spectators were all edified by the solicitude of the parish priest of St Paul's who despite his great age did not spare himself in offering consolation to the patient.'

Bouton, an officer of the watch, left us his account: 'The sulphur was lit, but the flame was so poor that only the top skin of the hand was burnt, and that only slightly. Then the executioner, his sleeves rolled up, took the steel pincers, which had been especially made for the occasion, and which were about a foot and a half long, and pulled first at the calf of the right leg, then at the thigh, and from there at the two fleshy parts of the right arm; then at the breasts. Though a strong, sturdy fellow, this executioner found it so difficult to tear away the pieces of flesh that he set about the same spot two or three times, twisting the pincers as he did so, and what he took away formed at each part a wound about the size of a six-pound crown piece.

'After these tearings with the pincers, Damiens, who cried out profusely, though without swearing, raised his head and looked at himself; the same executioner dipped an iron spoon in the pot containing the boiling potion, which he poured liberally over each wound. Then the ropes that were to be harnessed to the horses were attached with cords to the patient's body; the horses were then harnessed and placed alongside the arms and legs, one at each limb.

'Monsieur Le Breton, the clerk of the court, went up to the patient several times and asked him if he had anything to say. He said he had not; at each torment, he cried out, as the damned in hell are supposed to cry out, “Pardon, my God! Pardon, Lord.” Despite all this pain, he raised his head from time to time and looked at himself boldly. The cords had been tied so tightly by the men who pulled the ends that they caused him indescribable pain. Monsieur Le Breton went up to him again and asked him if he had anything to say; he said no. Several confessors went up to him and spoke to him at length; he willingly kissed the crucifix that was held out to him; he opened his lips and repeated: “Pardon, Lord.”

'The horses tugged hard, each pulling straight on a limb, each horse held by an executioner. After a quarter of an hour, the same ceremony was repeated and finally, after several attempts, the direction of the horses had to be changed, thus: those at the arms were made to pull towards the head, those at the thighs towards the arms, which broke the arms at the joints. This was repeated several times without success. He raised his head and looked at himself. Two more horses had to be added to those harnessed to the thighs, which made six horses in all. Without success.

'Finally, the executioner, Samson, said to Monsieur Le Breton that there was no way or hope of succeeding, and told him to ask their Lordships if they wished him to have the prisoner cut into pieces. Monsieur Le Breton, who had come down from the town, ordered that renewed efforts be made, and this was done; but the horses gave up and one of those har-
nessed to the thighs fell to the ground. The confessors returned and spoke to him again. He said to them (I heard him): “Kiss me, gentlemen.” The parish priest of St Paul’s did not dare to, so Monsieur de Marsilly slipped under the rope holding the left arm and kissed him on the forehead. The executioners gathered round and Damiens told them not to swear, to carry out their task and that he did not think ill of them; he begged them to pray to God for him, and asked the parish priest of St Paul’s to pray for him at the first mass.

‘After two or three attempts, the executioner Samson and he who had used the pincers each drew out a knife from his pocket and cut the body at the thighs instead of severing the legs at the joints; the four horses gave a tug and carried off the two thighs after them, namely, that of the right side first, the other following; then the same was done to the arms, the shoulders, the arm-pits and the four limbs; the flesh had to be cut almost to the bone, the horses pulling hard carried off the right arm first and the other afterwards.

‘When the four limbs had been pulled away, the confessors came to speak to him; but his executioner told them that he was dead, though the truth was that I saw the man move, his lower jaw moving from side to side as if he were talking. One of the executioners even said shortly afterwards that when they had lifted the trunk to throw it on the stake, he was still alive. The four limbs were untied from the ropes and thrown on the stake set up in the enclosure in line with the scaffold, then the trunk and the rest were covered with logs and faggots, and fire was put to the straw mixed with this wood.

‘... In accordance with the decree, the whole was reduced to ashes. The last piece to be found in the embers was still burning at half-past ten in the evening. The pieces of flesh and the trunk had taken about four hours to burn. The officers of whom I was one, as also was my son, and a detachment of archers remained in the square until nearly eleven o’clock.

‘There were those who made something of the fact that a dog had lain the day before on the grass where the fire had been, had been chased away several times, and had always returned. But it is not difficult to understand that an animal found this place warmer than elsewhere’

**PRISON**

This excerpt, from the 1830s, is a list of rules “for the House of young prisoners in Paris.”


Eighty years later, Léon Faucher drew up his rules ’for the House of young prisoners in Paris’:

‘Art. 17. The prisoners’ day will begin at six in the morning in winter and at five in summer. They will work for nine hours a day throughout the year. Two hours a day will be devoted to instruction. Work and the day will end at nine o’clock in winter and at eight in summer.

Art. 18. Rising. At the first drum-roll, the prisoners must rise and dress in silence, as the supervisor opens the cell doors. At the second drum-roll, they must be dressed and make their beds. At the third, they must line up and proceed to the chapel for morning prayer. There is a five-minute interval between each drum-roll.

Art. 19. The prayers are conducted by the chaplain and followed by a moral or religious reading. This exercise must not last more than half an hour.

Art. 20. Work. At a quarter to six in the summer, a quarter to seven in winter, the prisoners go down into the courtyard where they must wash their hands and faces, and receive their first ration of bread. Immediately afterwards, they form into work-teams and go off to work, which must begin at six in summer and seven in winter.

Art. 21. Meal. At ten o’clock the prisoners leave their work and go to the refectory; they wash their hands in their courtyards and assemble in divisions. After the dinner, there is recreation until twenty minutes to eleven.

Art. 22. School. At twenty minutes to eleven, at the drum-roll, the prisoners form into ranks, and proceed in divisions to the school. The class lasts two hours and consists alternately of reading, writing, drawing and arithmetic.

Art. 23. At twenty minutes to one, the prisoners leave the school, in divisions, and return to their courtyards for recreation. At five minutes to one, at the drum-roll, they form into work-teams.

Art. 24. At one o’clock they must be back in the workshops; they work until four o’clock.

Art. 25. At four o’clock the prisoners leave their workshops and go into the courtyards where they wash their hands and form into divisions for the refectory.
Art. 26. Supper and the recreation that follows last until five o'clock: the prisoners then return to the workshops.
Art. 27. At seven o'clock in the summer, at eight in winter, work stops; bread is distributed for the last time in the workshops. For a quarter of an hour one of the prisoners or supervisors reads a passage from some instructive or uplifting work. This is followed by evening prayer.
Art. 28. At half-past seven in summer, half-past eight in winter, the prisoners must be back in their cells after the washing of hands and the inspection of clothes in the courtyard; at the first drum-roll, they must undress, and at the second get into bed. The cell doors are closed and the supervisors go the rounds in the corridors, to ensure order and silence.

Questions:
1. What is the role of torture according to this excerpt? What made torture a reasonable and acceptable form of punishment in the eighteenth century and before?
2. What was the role of public executions?
16.2 Life in the Eighteenth Century: An Artisan's Journey

Ménétria, a glazier or glassworker, began writing his autobiography (partially modeled on Rousseau's autobiography *Confessions*) at the age of 26, when he married, settled down in Paris after his "tour de France," and opened up his own glass shop. Ménétria's lack of punctuation appears to be a matter of choice rather than of ignorance. His narration of events placed himself always at the center, but he often borrowed from the stock tales of the day, which may not have happened to him directly. Most likely a sans-culotte, Ménétria participated in local politics as a Jacobin and held several local offices.


To write the truth as I see it means not to speak of arms or heraldry to forget about one's ancestors and not to embellish one's name with vain titles.

I was born on 13 July 1738 a native of this great city. My father belonged to the class usually called artisans. His profession was that of glazier. Hence it is with him that I begin my family tree and I shall say nothing about my ancestors. My father married and set himself up at the same time and wed a virtuous girl who gave him four children—three daughters and one boy—myself all of whose little pranks I'm going to write about.

My father became a widower when I was two years old. I had been put out to nurse. My grandmother who always loved me a great deal and even idolized me knowing that the nurse I was with had her milk gone bad came to get me and after curing me put me back out to nurse (where) I ended up with a pretty good woman who taught me early on the profession of begging. She had for foster-child a mute whom people said I mimicked marvelously. My mother and my godfather when they came to see me and brought me a belt of the order of Saint Francis for they had pledged me to all the saints found me in a church begging charity. They took me home and from then until the age of eleven I lived with my good grandmother. My father wanted me back afraid that he would have to pay my board. He put me to work in his trade even though several people tried to talk him out of it (but) he wouldn't listen to them. I had a pretty good grandmother. As she had several children she tried every way she could to expatriate me from the house which got my father hot and very excited.

When a place as choirboy at Saint-Germain came open I won the competition. I stayed there around three or four months when I became sick with boredom from not seeing my grandmother.

In our house lived a fellow by the name of Simon whose job was to put the dead of our parish into coffins. As I was staying across the way with a cooper I heard a noise like a package falling on our sign. It was nighttime and (I) couldn't see anything. I tell my mother who runs down with a light and at that moment Simon's wife falls with the sign breaking the iron gibbet and falling dead in the street. Her husband was found asleep and drunk as usual and we remembered that she often said she would hang herself rather than live with such a drunk.

---

1 Ménétria uses the word “mother” interchangeably with “grandmother” and “good mother” (*bonne mère*) in referring to his maternal grandmother, Mme Marseau (*née* Boyer).

2 The holy sash distributed by Franciscan monks and certain confraternities to their young charges. It was intended as a reminder of the sash that St. Francis gave to St. Dominic in 1227 or 1228, an angelic sash that recurs in Franciscan iconography and symbolizes devotion to the baby Jesus and the Nativity.

3 *Demandant la calistade*, meaning begging. The term probably derives from the Italian carista or the Provençal *carestié*. Its use illustrates how foreign words were picked up by workers on the tour of France. Ménétria spent time in Provence.

4 Ménétria's parish is one of the oldest in Paris. As the parish of the Louvre, its population included not only working people but also aristocrats after the Court's return to Paris in 1715. The canons and curates of Saint-Germain had long maintained a choir school, which took in six pupils for training in music and Latin.
It was at this time that they had me take my first communion. I may say that I couldn't believe that the son of God allowed himself to be fed to men just like that. Since I went to catechism and had received several prizes and sometimes asked the priests questions that they answered in monosyllables either to shut my mouth or to shut me up, and said to me emphatically. These are mysteries. I had had many doubts about their sincerity after serving at mass one day as choirboy. I saw two devout women who wanted to take communion. It was at the end I told the priest who told me to go find the sacristan whom he asked whether there were any hosts in the ciborium. (The sacristan) answered that there were but that they were not consecrated. This virtuous priest responded that it made no difference. Because of that I never believed in their mysteries and particularly the words that this upright fellow allowed himself to utter. Blessing, chastity, and decency. So I never wanted to be with these hypocrites and have never liked their company.

I liked to make a kind of fireworks commonly known as Chinese rockets. Since these were invented not long ago, and since I went to the house of a cousin of mine who was a fireworks maker, and I went with my friends to play tricks on apple sellers and others by slipping (these firecrackers) under them and under their chairs, which made them jump in the air with fear and in our opinion, it was all for fun.

Finally, I went home to my father after making many promises few of which I kept. One day, I was working at the home of a woman of quality who made a bargain with me that each time her chambermaid would show herself to me, she would give six francs, and I would keep it a secret. It was this charming maid who received my first blushes also with her money. I had a ball. Since it happened often, I learned quite a bit. I couldn't hold on to such a fortune.

That led to other relations. And I remember the first prostitute who asked me up to her place, since I had heard that that sort of woman robs you. I had taken the trouble to put my money in one of my shoes. When I saw how well she behaved, I gave her double what she asked and this woman became one of my closest friends. These interludes were so pleasant that every day, I tried to make new conquests. In the end, my reward was what you might well imagine, and that made me a little wiser.

In these days, my father drank all the time and was always throwing me out of the house.

One Sunday night, he came home angry and full of wine threw himself on my sister and started to mistreat her. I wanted to help her but even worse befell me. In a rage, he threw himself on me, my sister tried to close a glass door, and caught my hand. Cry as I did, she didn't want to hear anything. I was forced to break one of the panes. My father shouted that I was trying to stab him. My hand was all bloody, and since he was yelling so loud, I made the mistake of drawing my knife to hide it, and he was shameless enough to tell everyone that I had tried to murder him and my dear sister to please him (though she) knew the truth let people believe it.

Then my relatives and my good grandmother who knew my father inside out and knew what he was capable of told me and forced me to leave him. I left Paris the first time on the day after Damiens' torture.

I went to work at Niort in Poitou where I stayed with good people who treated me like their child and made me the most beautiful promises in the world. I stayed there around three months. When I wanted to go to Poitiers to see my friends, it cost me plenty.

I arrived one Sunday morning and was hired to work the next day. After dinner, I was with my comrades on a kind of esplanade playing leapfrog. I went home to sleep peacefully at my master's house. When I went to work the next morning, two town constables asked me if I wasn't the Parisian. I answered yes. They invited me to follow them and put me in jail. After an hour, I saw a group of my comrades brought in and they imprisoned all the foreign companions.

---

22 King Louis XV was attacked and slightly wounded by Damiens on 5 January 1757. Fearing a conspiracy, the police clamped down, and the would-be regicide was executed in spectacular fashion in the place de Grève. Barbier, a lawyer, and Casanova have left accounts of this terrifying scene, which attracted thousands of spectators. Under the Ancien Régime, regicide was the most unpardonable of crimes, for it struck at God's sacred representative on earth and cast doubt on the paternal relationship of the monarch to his subjects. Ménétra attended the execution.

43 A reference to the four sergeants of police who served under the lieutenant criminel et de police and were responsible for patrolling the streets. The latter officer, a member of the présidial, one of the regular courts, was probably the one who interrogated Ménétra. This incident sheds light on the authorities' suspicion of the compagnonnages and on the rivalry between soldiers and civilians.
We stayed about six days rather well fed by the masters of the town. We were seated on the witness bench (sellette) and interrogated one after another like criminals. The judges had it in for me in particular because they said I was from Paris and looked like I knew what was what and answered them (more skillfully) than the others. We were accused me in particular of having cut down the young trees that stood on the esplanade. We stayed almost thirty days. (When) someone came to tell us, we were free. My comrades in misfortune made me write and demand reparations. The only answer we got was that we were free and justice had been done that the cadets of the regiment had been demoted and that it was they who had done the damage.

I received a letter from Nantes from one Guépin letting me know that if I wanted to stay with a widow he had told her a lot of good things and he would send me twelve francs in the mail.

I left my old comrade and set out on the road to Nantes where in a big field I ran into two Gavots who tried to take my bag. I defended myself and didn't want to use my weapon unless I had to. By chance, two companion hat makers happened by and gave them what they deserved. I arrived in Nantes where, the companions were expecting me and hired on with a widow who seemed charmed to have me and I was enchanted to stay with her because in my opinion she was a charming woman. I hadn't been with my good widow three weeks when one Sunday she gave me four louis to buy a suit because she'd heard me say that I liked a gray color that I saw a young fellow wearing. I refused but the gift was so kindly offered that I accepted.

I stayed for nearly eleven months with my widow because the town was proscribed so that there were only three companions there. We drove the masters wild and had many different ones. One day the first warden of the guild came to make a pact to get the companions to come back. After some amiable talk, we got angry and even abused one another. Without help from my comrades, I threw him out the window. And I was obliged because there had been so much noise to jump myself into the manure heap where I didn't hurt myself. After that we didn't want to hear any more talk. Finally other masters came looking for us and we wrote to bring the companions back in. That was a great treat for me because all the masters entertained us.

I was in my widow's good graces. We sat together at table after the companions had had their meal and we amused ourselves drinking good wines and my widow was captivated. She told me one day that she had let herself fall so that I could pick her up the way I picked up one of my mistresses. That's what I did. So I found myself the master of the house. Nothing could be done without my consent. Sometimes there was trouble because of my negligence.

Then came the celebration of Twelfth Night. The mother of companions invited all the companions of every trade to pass round the cake. There were well near a hundred and eighty of us. My friends and I were afraid that one of us would catch the bean because the rule was that the bean king and his comrades were obliged to treat. With this apprehension in our minds, the bean fell to me. They decorated me with ribbons. I asked to speak. Everyone listened. I said, “My countrymen, you know that the glaziers' trade has the fewest companions. We cannot treat you as you deserve. I beg you to elect another king in my place and I willingly give up my royalty.” And with one voice, they all said, “Every man will pay his share only. The king will be exempt.”

I missed a great opportunity. This widow sold glass wholesale to all the masters in towns for twenty leagues around and made shipments to the Isles. I was the one who did all this business and wrote all her letters and counterfeited her signature so well that no one could tell the difference. Everything passed through me and I couldn't keep still. I always needed something new and was always on the run.

All the companion glaziers were assembled to draw for the chance to glaze the king's vessels in Brest. Three of us were taken. They gave us a green cockade and fifteen francs to travel sixty leagues through terrible country on bad roads escorted by marshals from brigade to brigade all for fear we'd wander off.

* In other words, the city was boycotted by the companion glaziers of the Devoir because they were dissatisfied with the pay or working conditions. In reading about this episode, the reader should keep in mind the major construction work that began in Nantes in 1755.
A few days later since I was about to get married I went to see Father Basuel I needed a confession certificate which was absolutely indispensable I told him that I had come to make my peace with the Church not with God because I have always worshipped the Eternal but without having much faith in what the priests have to say about all their mysteries He answered that he didn’t want to listen to me much less to hear me (confess) I begged him Wasted words I left

When the day came I asked my father to take the bride’s hand as is usually done My father started making contortions that displeased not just me but both families I invited one of my uncles who was most delighted and who was grateful to me for it I gave a meal and my relatives asked me it wasn’t my father who had boasted that he would give the lunch I answered them that it was at my expense So for the supper they made him toss into the hat like everybody else And so ended my dealings with my father who behaved toward one of his own children less well that he would have done and acted toward a stranger

Before tying the knot and subjecting myself to the yoke of marriage I had to go to the trouble of getting that wretched confession certificate A person I knew got me one from a Recollect Father in exchange for a few bottles and three livres That was all it took which shows that for wine and money the ministers of the altars will even sell indulgences and that anybody who gives them enough silver be he the greatest criminal who ever was the gates of paradise are open for him and closed forever to the poor and indigent Which shows the holiness of the Roman religion

Years Later

My shop and my trade began to be a burden to me I had two living children and as they say I had a king’s desires Two boys had died because of the carelessness of their nurse I was no longer the master the wife anticipated everything To have peace I overlooked things Getting ahead was her main passion and mine was to enjoy myself it was impossible to reconcile the two In the end I took up some of my old habits in spite of everything I took care of the house and despite the carrying on in secret and the arguments we prospered

Some time later Mary full of grace took it into her head to leave me She took our daughter and everything she could carry with her including the silverware and went back where she came from (She) was gone for two or three months During that period I passed the time rather well thanks to my governess who came often to keep me company since my wife had left home the way she did having packed her bags as they say

I didn’t lose heart and while she was gone I kept up the business And everything went according to my desires I always tried to do the right thing because I foresaw that if I wasn’t careful I would be scorned and subject to slander I set myself above it all and went my own way Still I made the acquaintance of a charming widow who wanted me to declare my wife in separation but my wishes were not hers I’ve never liked legal proceedings what is more I had children Seeing that I didn’t want to talk about this subject and since she was rich and had retired on comfortable means promising myself that I would be happier we broke off

Finally in spite of everything it was my old lady who still prevailed Passing in front of Saint-Eustache and not thinking about her at all I ran into her We found ourselves face to face I wanted to talk to her She ran A few days later she sent for me I refused to see her Finally I was persuaded and little by little she began to behave as usual that is to say that she always took her share and turned it over to her sister and nephews So I never had to worry when it was a question of needing a hundred écus for the business they found friends who would lend to them right away But those friends were really her secret hiding places One day I caught her counting out the money I needed the cash was in an alley (and she) tried to make me believe that somebody had lent her the money I shut my eyes just to have some peace So I left her to carry the household burdens and thought only of pleasing my public

215 The Recollect monastery in the faubourg Saint-Laurent sheltered some sixty friars in the 1760s. These Franciscans were rather popular in Paris and among soldiers in the army, which they often served as chaplains.

240 The old civil law made no provision for divorce, which was incompatible with the religious doctrine of indissoluble marriage, but it did allow séparation de corps et biens (separation of bodies and property), which could be obtained from the civil courts-in Paris, the Châtelet. The procedure was long and costly, and remarriage was impossible. Ending a civil marriage was made legal when the Revolution secularized the law (law of 20 September 1792)
So the days passed and our time elapsed eating and drinking at Mme Bouchu’s and working at home and come what may I was always looking for ways to keep from getting bored. My work allowed me to make the acquaintance of many women and I tried as hard as I could to sacrifice to Cupid. Sometimes I was punished for it and always by those goddesses who behave like prudes and act so reserved. That gave me food for thought, but passion won out.

Finally calculation (and) self-interest though never among my vices because I was never of an ambitious character (but) in the end the prospect that if I kept quiet I would have enough to live fairly well in my old age if the Eternal granted me a long life that gave me food for thought and I began then to lead a quieter life and to pay more attention besides which age was beginning to gray my hair. I did not give up love entirely but like the heroes of old I rested on my laurels and made sacrifices and oblations to Bacchus though I had never been one of his biggest worshippers and never sacrificed to him except in company.

The hope of an easier life in my old age had more influence on me than all the moralizing I had endured and I was enjoying myself and watching my days go by when the French Revolution came suddenly and revived all our spirits. And the word liberty so often repeated had an almost supernatural effect and invigorated us all.

People rushed to arms and supported those who called themselves the fathers of the people. This revolution was supposed to secure the happiness of the French people by confining the king to his throne and returning to all the rights that the parlements the priesthood the nobility had usurped under the leadership of ministers [who were] inept [and] outrageous liars who thought only of their pleasures and their ambition trampling the constitution of the state underfoot or making it serve their whims or to put it better still it [the constitution] was unknown [to them]. The debts of the State doubled [There was] nothing to do but (make use) of the wealth of the clergy which could contribute to the State's burden. But these immoral men who constituted a second authority by means of all the chimeras invented by lies and sustained by ignorance backed up by fanaticism and superstition these creatures preferred to see the Nation fall into adversity rather than make the slightest sacrifice. Thus they were and will always be the cause of misfortune in those nations that they uphold with their ancient Gothic prejudices.

I shall draw a curtain over those days of horror that descended upon France. My son was happy. He was fighting for his country. It was the second time that he returned to the army. He risked his life. It is true but never got mixed up in all the horrors that were being committed with impunity. And those ogres even took pride in their crimes.

Finally the murders ended280 but people were still unhappy. This National Convention in which everyone had the greatest confidence was and one can say so nothing but a den of slanders of vindictive men seeking to slaughter one party so as to replace it with another. They made the people march according to their passion. The tocsin and the general281 were as people often said the order of the day. All these evils had overwhelmed the sections.

People watched one another. Nobody dared to say what he thought. We were constantly under arms sometimes to guard the Convention other times to guard the supplies of food.

Questions:
1. What do you learn from Ménétra about the work of an artisan? Consider his skills, learning experiences, advancement, difficulties, etc.
2. How much freedom and control did an artisan have? Explain.
3. What do you learn about artisanal family relations, entertainment, social relations, perceptions on politics, religion, etc.?
4. Compare Ménétra’s description of his life with that of Cellini in the Renaissance (Document 10.5). What similarities and differences do you see? What factors might explain both the similarities and the differences?

---

280 An allusion to the change that occurred on the Ninth and Tenth of Thermidor in the Year II with the fall of Robespierre, which put an end to the Terror and shifted power to the Assembly, which was divided into several factions, with the remnants of the Jacobins, the reactionaries and royalists led by Fréron and the jeunesse dorée, and a large group of moderates. In the sections this was a period of turmoil, with former Jacobins and terrorists under attack.

281 Le tocsin et la générale: official signals using drums to assemble armed section members and bells whose repeated long, slow peals gave the alarm.
16.3 Instructions for a New Law Code

Greatly influenced by Enlightenment ideas, Catherine wrote an instruction for producing a new law code based on that thinking. Notice, for instance, the use of Beccaria’s words and ideas about punishment (Document 18.3). While the Commission met to construct the new law code it faced many difficulties and disagreements, particularly about serfdom, and a new law code was never enacted. The Commission disbanded with the start of war with Turkey (1768–1774) and never reconvened.


O Lord my God, hearken unto me, and instruct me; that I may administer Judgment unto thy People; as thy sacred Laws direct to judge with Righteousness!

THE INSTRUCTIONS TO THE COMMISSIONERS FOR COMPOSING A NEW CODE OF LAWS

1. The Christian Law teaches us to do mutual Good to one another, as much as possibly we can.
2. Laying this down as a fundamental Rule prescribed by that Religion, which has taken, or ought to take Root in the Hearts of the whole People; we cannot but suppose, that every honest Man in the Community is, or will be, desirous of seeing his native Country at the very Summit of Happiness, Glory, Safety, and Tranquillity.
3. And that every Individual Citizen in particular must wish to see himself protected by Laws, which should not distress him in his Circumstances, but, on the Contrary, should defend him from all Attempts of others, that are repugnant to this fundamental Rule.

6. Russia is a European State.
7. This is clearly demonstrated by the following Observations: The Alterations which Peter the Great undertook in Russia succeeded with the greater Ease, because the Manners, which prevailed at that Time, and had been introduced amongst us by a Mixture of different Nations, and the Conquest of foreign Territories, were quite unsuitable to the Climate. Peter the First, by introducing the Manners and Customs of Europe among the European People in his Dominions, found at that Time such means as even he himself was not sanguine enough to expect....
9. The Sovereign is absolute; for there is no other Authority but that which centers in his single person, that can act with a vigour proportionate to the Extent of such a vast Dominion.
10. The Extent of the Dominion requires an absolute Power to be vested in that Person who rules over it. It is expedient so to be, that the quick Dispatch of Affairs, sent from distant Paris, might make ample Amends for the Delay occasioned by the great Distance of the Places.
11. Every other Form of Government whatsoever would not only have been prejudicial to Russia, but would even have proved its entire Ruin.
12. Another Reason is: That it is better to be subject to the Laws under one Master, than to be subservient to many.
13. What is the true End of Monarchy? Not to deprive People of their natural Liberty; but to correct their Actions, in order to attain the supreme Good.

15. The Intention and the End of Monarchy, is the Glory of the Citizens, of the State, and of the Sovereign.
16. But, from this Glory, a Sense of Liberty arises in a People governed by a Monarch; which may produce in these States as much Energy in transacting the most important Affairs, and may contribute as much to the Happiness of the Subjects, as even Liberty itself....
33. The Laws ought to be so framed, as to secure the Safety of every Citizen as much as possible.
34. The Equality of the Citizens consists in this; that they should all be subject to the same Laws.
35. This Equality requires Institutions so well adapted, as to prevent the Rich from oppressing those who are not so wealthy as themselves, and converting all the Charges and Employments intrusted to them as Magistrates only, to their own private Emolument....
38. A Man ought to form in his own Mind an exact and clear Idea of what Liberty is. Liberty is the Right of doing whatsoever the Laws allow: And if any one Citizen could do what the Laws forbid, there would be no more Liberty; because others would have an equal Power of doing the same.

41. Nothing ought to be forbidden by the Laws, but what may be prejudicial, either to every Individual in particular, or to the whole Community in general.

193. The Torture of the Rack is a Cruelty established and made use of by many Nations, and is applied to the Party accused during the Course of his Trial, either to extort from him a Confession of his Guilt, or in order to clear up some Contradictions in which he had involved himself during his Examination, or to compel him to discover his Accomplices, or in order to discover other Crimes, of which, though he is not accused, yet he may perhaps be guilty.

194. (1) No Man ought to be looked upon as guilty before he has received his judicial Sentence; nor can the Laws deprive him of their Protection before it is proved that he has forfeited all Right to it. What Right therefore can Power give to any to inflict Punishment upon a Citizen at a Time when it is yet dubious whether he is innocent or guilty?

The Party accused on the Rack, whilst in the Agonies of Torture, is not Master enough of himself to be able to declare the Truth. Can we give more Credit to a Man when he is lightheaded in a Fever, than when he enjoys the free Use of his Reason in a State of Health? The Sensation of Pain may arise to such a Height that, after having subdued the whole Soul, it will leave her no longer the Liberty of producing any proper Act of the Will, except that of taking the shortest instantaneous Method, in the very twinkling of an Eye, as it were, of getting rid of her Torment. In such an Extremity, even an innocent Person will roar out that he is guilty, only to gain some Respite from his Tortures. Thus the very same Expedient, which is made use of to distinguish the Innocent from the Guilty, will take away the whole Difference between them; and the Judges will be as uncertain whether they have an innocent or a guilty Person before them, as they were before the Beginning of this partial Way of Examination. The Rack, therefore, is a sure Method of condemning an innocent person of a weakly Constitution, and of acquitting a wicked Wretch, who depends upon the Robustness of his Frame.

220. A Punishment ought to be immediate, analogous to the Nature of the Crime, and known to the Public.

221. The sooner the Punishment succeeds to the Commission of a Crime, the more useful and just it will be. Just; because it will spare the Malefactor the torturing and useless Anguish of Heart about the Uncertainty of his Destiny. Consequently the Decision of an Affair, in a Court of Judicature, ought to be finished in as little Time as possible. I have said before that Punishment immediately inflicted is most useful; the Reason is because the smaller the Interval of Time is which passes between the Crime and the Punishment, the more the Crime will be esteemed as a Motive to the Punishment, and the Punishment as an Effect of the Crime. Punishment must be certain and unavoidable.

222. The most certain Curb upon Crimes is not the Severity of the Punishment, but the absolute Conviction in the People that Delinquents will be inevitably punished....

250. A Society of Citizens, as well as every Thing else, requires a certain fixed Order: There ought to be some to govern, and others to obey.

252. And, consequently, as the Law of Nature commands Us to take as much Care, as lies in Our Power, of the Prosperity of all the People; we are obliged to alleviate the Situation of the Subjects, as much as sound Reason will permit.

253. And therefore, to shun all Occasions of reducing People to a State of Slavery, except the utmost Necessity should inevitably oblige us to do it; in that Case, it ought not to be done for our own Benefit; but for the Interest of the State: Yet even that Case is extremely uncommon.

264. Of the Propagation of the human Species in a State.
265. Russia is not only greatly deficient in the number of her Inhabitants; but at the same Time, extends her Dominion over immense Tracts of Land; which are neither peopled nor improved. And therefore, in a Country so circumstanced, too much Encouragement can never be given to the Propagation of the human Species.

266. The Peasants Generally have twelve, fifteen, and even twenty Children by one Marriage; but it rarely happens that one Fourth of these ever attains to the Age of Maturity. There must therefore be some Fault, either in their Nurture, in their Way of Living, or Method of Education, which occasions this prodigious Loss, and disappoints the Hopes of the Empire. How flourishing would the State of this Empire be if we could but ward off, or prevent this fatal Evil by proper Regulations!

313. Agriculture is the first and principal Labour, which ought to be encouraged in the People: The next is, the manufacturing our own Produce.

354. Machines, which serve to shorten Labour in the mechanick Arts, are not always useful. If a Piece of Work, wrought with the Hands, can be afforded at a Price, equally advantageous to the Merchant and the Manufacturer; in this Case, Machines which shorten Labour, that is, which diminish the Number of Workmen, will be greatly prejudicial to a populous Country.

355. Yet, we ought to distinguish between what we manufacture for our Home-consumption, and what we manufacture for Exportation into foreign Countries.

356. Too much Use cannot be made of this Kind of Machines in our Manufactures, which we export to other Nations; who do, or may receive the same Kind of Goods, from our Neighbours, or other People; especially those who are in the same Situation with ourselves.

357. Commerce flies from Places where it meets with Oppression, and settles where it meets with Protection.

358. Every one ought to inculcate the Fear of God into the tender Minds of Children, to encourage every laudable Inclination, and to accustom them to the fundamental Rules, suitable to their respective Situations; to incite in them a Desire for Labour, and a Dread of Idleness, as the Root of all Evil, and Error; to train them up to a proper Decorum in their Actions and Conversation, Civility, and Decency in their Behaviour; and to sympathise with the Miseries of poor unhappy Wretches; and to break them of all perverse and forward Humours; to teach them Oeconomy, and whatever is most useful in all Affairs of Life; to guard them against all Prodigality and Extravagance; and particularly to root a proper Love of Cleanliness and Neatness, as well in themselves as in those who belong to them; in a Word, to instill all those Virtues and Qualities, which join to form a good Education; by which, as they grow up, they may prove real Citizens, useful Members of the Community, and Ornaments to their Country.

359. Of the Nobility.

360. Virtue with Merit raises People to the Rank of Nobility.

361. Virtue and Honour ought to be the Rules, which prescribe Love for their Country, Zeal for its Service, Obedience and Fidelity to their Sovereign; and continually suggest, never to be guilty of an infamous Action.

362. Of the middling Sort of People.

363. This Sort of People, of whom we ought now to speak, and from whom the State expects much Benefit, are admitted into the Middling Rank, if their Qualifications are firmly established upon Good Manners, and Incitements to Industry.

364. People of this Rank will enjoy a State of Liberty, without intermixing either with the Nobility or the Husbandmen.
381. Besides these, all those, who are not of the Nobility, but have been educated in Schools or Colleges, of what Denomination soever, ecclesiastical or civil, founded by Us and Our Ancestors:

382. Also the Children of People belonging to the Law. But as in that third Species, there are different Degrees of Privilege, therefore we shall not enter into a Detail of Particulars; but only open the Way for a due Consideration of it.

383. As the whole Qualification, which intitles People to this middling Rank, is founded upon good Manners and Industry; the Violation of these Rules will serve, on the Contrary, for their Exclusion from it; as for Instance, Perfidiousness and Breach of Promise, especially if caused by Idleness and Treachery.

Questions:
1. How did the Instructions embody Enlightenment ideas?
2. Why might the Commission, composed of nobles and commoners, have had trouble implementing these instructions?
16.4  Jonathan Swift: A Description of a City Shower

The great English writer Johnathan Swift (1667–1745) made a career out of satirizing the failings and follies of early modern society. Most famous for *Gulliver's Travels* (1726), his masterpiece, Swift brought attention to the inequities and injustices of his society. In the poem included here, Swift painted an unflattering picture of early modern urban life.


Careful observers may foretell the hour
(By sure prognostics) when to dread a shower:
While rain depends,\(^1\) the pensive cat gives o’er
Her frolics, and pursues her tail no more.
Returning home at night, you’ll find the sink\(^2\)
Strike your offended sense with double stink.
If you be wise, then go not far to dine;
You’ll spend in coach hire more than save in wine.
A coming shower your shooting corns presage,
Old achés throb, your hollow tooth will rage. 10
Sauntering in coffeehouse is Dulman\(^3\) seen;
He damns the climate and complains of spleen.
Meanwhile the South, rising with dabbled wings,
That swilled more liquor than it could contain,
And, like a drunkard, gives it up again.
Brisk Susan whips her linen from the rope,
While the first drizzling shower is borne aslope:
Such is that sprinkling which some careless quean\(^4\)
Flirts on you from her mop, but not so clean:
You fly, invoke the gods; then turning, stop
To rail; she singing, still whirls on her mop.
Not yet the dust had shunned the unequal strife,
But, aided by the wind, fought still for life,
And wafted with its foe by violent gust,
‘Twas doubtful which was rain and which was dust.
Ah! where must needy poet seek for aid,
When dust and rain at once his coat invade?
Sole coat, where dust cemented by the rain
Erects the nap, and leaves a mingled stain. 30
Now in contiguous drops the flood comes down,
Threatening with deluge this devoted town.
To shops in crowds the daggled\(^5\) females fly,
Pretend to cheapen goods, but nothing buy.
The Templar\(^6\) spruce, while every spout’s abroach,
Stays till ‘tis fair, yet seems to call a coach.

---

\(^{1}\) Impends, is imminent. An example of elevated diction used frequently throughout the poem in order to gain a mock dignity, comically inappropriate to the homely and realistic subject.

\(^{2}\) Sewer.

\(^{3}\) A type name (from "dull man"), like Congreve’s “Petulant” or “Witwoud.” It was commonly believed at this time that the Englishman’s tendency to melancholy (“the spleen”) was attributable to the rainy climate.

\(^{4}\) Wench, slut.

\(^{5}\) Spattered with mud. “To cheapen”: to bargain with.

\(^{6}\) A young man engaged in studying law. In the literature of the period the Templar is usually depicted as neglecting his professional studies for the sake of dissipation and the pursuit of literature. Cf. the Member of the Inner Temple in *Spectator* 2. “Abroach”: pouring out water.
The tucked-up sempstress walks with hasty strides,  
While streams run down her oiled umbrella’s sides.  
Here various kinds, by various fortunes led,  
Commence acquaintance underneath a shed.  
Triumphant Tories and desponding Whigs  
Forget their feuds, 7 and join to save their wigs.  
Boxed in a chair 8 the beau impatient sits,  
While spouts run clattering o’er the roof by fits,  
And ever and anon with frightful din  
The leather sounds; 9 he trembles from within.  
So when Troy chairmen bore the wooden steed,  
Pregnant with Greeks impatient to be freed  
(Those bully Greeks, who, as the moderns do,  
Instead of paying chairmen, run them through),  
Laocoön struck the outside with his spear,  
And each imprisoned hero quaked for fear.  
Now from all parts the swelling kennels 3 flow,  
And bear their trophies with them as they go:  
Filth of all hues and odors seem to tell  
What street they sailed from, by their sight and smell.  
They, as each torrent drives with rapid force,  
From Smithfield or St. Pulchre’s shape their course,  
And in huge confluence joined at Snow Hill ridge,  
Fall from the conduit prone to Holborn Bridge.  
Drowned puppies, stinking sprats, 5 all drenched in mud,  
Dead cats, and turnip tops, come tumbling down the flood. 6

Question:
1. What can we learn from Swift about urban life and conditions?

7 The Whig ministry had just fallen and the Tories, led by Harley and St. John, were forming the government with which Swift was to be closely associated until the death of the queen in 1714.
8 Sedan chair.
9 The roof of the sedan chair was made of leather.

1 Run them through with their swords. The bully, always prone to violence, was a familiar figure in London streets and places of amusement.
2 Aeneid 2:40–53.
3 The open gutters in the middle of the street.
4 An accurate description of the drainage system of this part of London—the eastern edge of Holborn and West Smithfield, which lie outside the old walls west and east of Newgate. The great cattle and sheep markets were in Smithfield. The church of St. Sepulchre (“St. Pulchre’s”) stood opposite Newgate Prison. Holborn Conduit was at the foot of Snow Hill. It drained into Fleet Ditch, an evil-smelling open sewer, at Holborn Bridge.
5 Small herrings.
6 In Falkner’s edition of Swift’s Works (Dublin, 1735) a note almost certainly suggested by Swift points to the concluding triplet, with its constant final alexandrine, as a burlesque of a mannerism of Dryden and other Restoration poets, and claims that Swift’s ridicule banished the tuplet from on temporary poetry.
16.5 The Creation of the Steam Loom

After the mechanization of spinning, the bottleneck in production occurred in weaving. The following excerpt from an 1823 history of the cotton manufacture describes the process by which the mechanized production of weaving “caught up” with spinning and some of the consequences of that development.


The same powerful agent which so materially forwarded and advanced the progress of the Cotton Manufacture in the concluding part of the last century, has lately been further used as a substitute for manual labour, and the Steam Engine is now applied to the working of the Loom as well as to the preparatory processes.

In 1785, the Rev. E. Cartwright invented a Loom to be worked by water or steam. The following account of this invention is taken from the Supplement to the Encyclopedia Britannica:—“Happening to be at Matlock, in the summer of 1784, I fell in company with some gentlemen of Manchester, when the conversation turned on Arkwright's spinning machinery. One of the company observed, that as soon as Arkwright's patent expired, so many mills would be erected, and so much cotton spun, that hands never could be found to weave it. To this observation I replied that Arkwright must then set his wits to work to invent a weaving mill. This brought on a conversation on the subject, in which the Manchester gentlemen unanimously agreed that the thing was impracticable; and in defence of their opinion, they adduced arguments which I certainly was incompetent to answer or even to comprehend, being totally ignorant of the subject, having never at that time seen a person weave. I controverted, however, the impracticability of the thing, by remarking that there had lately been exhibited in London, an automation figure, which played at chess. Now you will not assert, gentlemen, said I, that it is more difficult to construct a machine that shall weave, then one which shall make all the variety of moves which are required in that complicated game.

Some little time afterwards, a particular circumstance recalling this conversation to my mind, it struck me, that, as in plain weaving, according to the conception I then had of the business, there could only be three movements, which were to follow each other in succession, there would be little difficulty in producing and repeating them. Full of these ideas, I immediately employed a carpenter and smith to carry them into effect. As soon as the machine was finished, I got a weaver to put in the warp, which was of such materials as sail cloth is usually made of. To my great delight, a piece of cloth, such as it was, was the produce.

As I had never before turned my thoughts to any thing mechanical, either in theory or practice, nor had ever seen a loom at work, or knew anything of its construction, you will readily suppose that my first Loom must have been a most rude piece of machinery.

The warp was placed perpendicularly, the reed fell with a force of at least half an hundred weight, and the springs which threw the shuttle were strong enough to have thrown a Congreve rocket. In short, it required the strength of two powerful men to work the machine at a slow rate, and only for a short time. Conceiving in my great simplicity, that I had accomplished all that was required, I then secured what I thought a most valuable property, by a patent, 4th April, 1785. This being done, I then condescended to see how other people wove; and you will guess my astonishment, when I compared their easy modes of operation with mine. Availing myself, however, of what I then saw, I made a Loom in its general principles, nearly as they are now made. But it was not till the year 1787, that I completed my invention, when I took out my last weaving patent, August 1st, of that year.”

Mr. Cartwright erected a weaving mill at Doncaster, which he filled with Looms. This concern was unsuccessful, and at last was abandoned, and some years afterwards, upon an application from a number of manufacturers at Manchester, Parliament granted Mr. Cartwright a sum of money as a remuneration for his ingenuity and trouble.

About 1790, Mr. Grimshaw, of Manchester, under a licence from Mr. Cartwright, erected a weaving factory turned by a Steam Engine. The great loss of time experienced in dressing the warp, which was done in small portions as it unrolled from the beam, and other difficulties arising from the quality of the yarn then spun, were in this instance formidable obstacles to success; the factory, however, was burnt down before it could be fully ascertained whether the experiment would succeed or not, and for many years no further attempts were made in Lancashire to weave by steam.

Mr. Austin, of Glasgow, invented a similar Loom, in 1789, which he still further improved in 1798, and a building to contain two hundred of these Looms was erected by Mr. Monteith, of Pollockshaws, in 1800.
In the year 1803, Mr. Thomas Johnson, of Bradbury, in Cheshire, invented the Dressing Frame. Before this invention the warp was dressed in the Loom in small portions as it unrolled from the beam, the Loom ceasing to work during the operation. Mr. Johnson's machine dresses the whole warp at once; when dressed the warp is placed in the Loom which now works without intermission. A factory for Steam Looms was built in Manchester, in 1806. Soon afterwards two others were erected at Stockport, and about 1809, a fourth was completed in Westhoughton. In these renewed attempts to weave by steam, considerable improvements were made in the structure of the Looms, in the mode of warping, and in preparing the weft for the shuttle. With these improvements, aided by others in the art of spinning, which enabled the spinners to make yarn much superior to that made in 1790, and assisted by Johnson's machine, which is peculiarly adapted for the dressing of warps for Steam Looms, the experiment succeeded. Before the invention of the Dressing Frame, one Weaver was required to each Steam Loom, at present a boy or girl, fourteen or fifteen years of age, can manage two Steam Looms, and with their help can weave three and a half times as much cloth as the best hand Weaver. The best hand Weavers seldom produce a piece of uniform evenness; indeed, it is next to impossible for them to do so, because a weaker or stronger blow with the lathe immediately alters the thickness of the cloth, and after an interruption of some hours, the most experienced weaver finds it difficult to recommence with a blow of precisely the same force as the one with which he left off. In Steam Looms, the lathe gives a steady, certain blow, and when once regulated by the engineer, moves with the greatest precision from the beginning to the end of the piece. Cloth made by these Looms, when seen by those manufacturers who employ hand Weavers, at once excites admiration and a consciousness that their own workmen cannot equal it. The increasing number of Steam Looms is a certain proof of their superiority over the Hand Looms. In 1818, there were in Manchester, Stockport, Middleton, Hyde, Stayley Bridge, and their vicinities, fourteen factories, containing about two thousand Looms. In 1821, there were in the same neighbourhoods thirty-two factories, containing five thousand seven hundred and thirty-two Looms. Since 1821, their number has still farther increased, and there are at present not less than ten thousand Steam Looms at work in Great Britain.

It is a curious circumstance, that, when the Cotton Manufacturer was in its infancy, all the operations, from the dressing of the raw material to its being finally turned out in the state of cloth, were completed under the roof of the weaver's cottage. The course of improved manufacture which followed, was to spin the yarn in factories and to weave it in cottages. At the present time, when the manufacture has attained a mature growth, all the operations, with vastly increased means and more complex contrivances, are gained performed in a single building. The Weaver's cottage with its rude apparatus of peg warping, hand cards, hand wheels, and imperfect looms, was the Steam Loom factory in miniature. Those vast brick edifices in the vicinity of all the great manufacturing towns in the south of Lancashire, towering to the height of seventy or eighty feet, which strike the attention and excite the curiosity of the traveller, now perform labours which formerly employed whole villages. In the Steam Loom factories, the cotton is carded, roved, spun, and woven into cloth, and the same quantum of labour is now performed in one of these structures which formerly occupied the industry of an entire district.

A very good Hand Weaver, a man twenty-five or thirty years of age, will weave two pieces of nine-eighths shirting per week, each twenty-four yards long, and containing one hundred and five shoots of weft in an inch, the reed of the cloth being a forty-four, Bolton count, and the warp and weft forty hanks to the pound. A Steam Loom Weaver, fifteen years of age, will in the same time weave seven similar pieces. A Steam Loom factory containing two hundred Looms, with the assistance of one hundred persons under twenty years of age, and of twenty-five men, will weave seven hundred pieces per week, of the length and quality before described. To manufacture one hundred similar pieces per week by the hand, it would be necessary to employ at least one hundred and twenty-five Looms, because many of the Weavers are females, and have cooking, washing, cleaning and various other duties to perform; others of them are children, and consequently, unable to weave as much as the men. It requires a man of mature age and a very good Weaver to weave two of the pieces in a week, and there is also an allowance to be made for sickness and other incidents. Thus, eight hundred and seventy-five hand Looms would be required to produce the seven hundred pieces per week; and reckoning the weavers, with their children, and the aged and infirm belonging to them, at two and a half to each loom, it may very safely be said, that the work done in a Steam Factory containing two hundred Looms, would, if done by hand Weavers, find employment and support for a population of more than two thousand persons.
The Steam Looms are chiefly employed in Weaving printing cloth and shirtings; but they also weave thicksetts, fancy cords, dimities, cambries and quiltings, together with silks, worsteds, and fine woollen or broad cloth. Invention is progressive, every improvement that is made is the foundation of another, and as the attention of hundreds of skilful mechanics and manufacturers is now turned to the improvement of the Seam Loom, it is probable that its application will become as general, and its efficiency as great, in Weaving, as the Jenny, Water Frame and Mule, are in Spinning, and that it will, in this country at least, entirely supersede the hand Loom.

Questions:
1. What were the costs and benefits of the machines and new divisions of labor? Consider not just the product and the technology, but work location, labor force, consumption, class relations, etc.
2. What hopes and fears were expressed about the future of the new technology?
3. How have these hopes and fears materialized (or not) in the past 200 years? Are the hopes and fears still valid or not?
4. How are workers and manufacturers described and by whom? What conclusions can you draw from these descriptions?
5. How might these descriptions have shaped people's understanding? How might they have been shaped by ideas of the day (consider, for instance, Enlightenment ideas, see Chapter 18).
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16.6 Protesting the Machines

The coming of machines, while promoted by advocates for the entrepreneurs/manufacturers (Document 3), was often resisted by skilled artisans and rural workers (who gained extra income from cottage industry). In 1756, some English woolen workers sent the following petition to the local newspaper.


To the Merchants, Clothiers and all such as wish well to the Staple Manufactory of this Nation.

The Humble ADDRESS and PETITION of Thousands, who labour in the Cloth Manufactory.

SHEWETH, That the Scribbling-Machines have thrown thousands of your petitioners out of employ, whereby they are brought into great distress, and are not able to procure a maintenance for their families, and deprived them of the opportunity of bringing up their children to labour: We have therefore to request, that prejudice and self-interest may be laid aside, and that you may pay that attention to the following facts, which the nature of the case requires.

The number of Scribbling-Machines extending about seventeen miles southwest of LEEDS, exceed all belief, being no less than one hundred and seventy! and as each machine will do as much work in twelve hours, as ten men can in that time do by hand, (speaking within bounds) and they working night- and day, one machine will do as much work in one day as would otherwise employ twenty men.

As we do not mean to assert any thing but what we can prove to be true, we allow four men to be employed at each machine twelve hours, working night and day, will take eight men in twenty-four hours; so that, upon a moderate computation twelve men are thrown out of employ for every single machine used in scribbling; and as it may be supposed the number of machines in all the other quarters together, nearly equal those in the South-West, full four thousand men are left to shift for a living how they can, and must of course fall to the Parish, if not time relieved. Allowing one boy to be bound apprentice from each family out of work, eight thousand hands are deprived of the opportunity of getting a livelihood.

We therefore hope, that the feelings of humanity will lead those who have it in their power to prevent the use of those machines, to give every discouragement they can to what has a tendency so prejudicial to their fellow-creatures....

We wish to propose a few queries to those who would plead for the further continuance of these machines:

How are those men, thus thrown out of employ to provide for their families; and what are they to put their children apprentice to, that the rising generation may have something to keep them at work, in order that they may not be like vagabonds strolling about in idleness? Some day, Begin and learn some other business.-Suppose we do, who will maintain our families, whilst we undertake the arduous task; and when we have learned it, how do we know we shall be any better for all our pains; for by the time we have served our second apprenticeship, another machine may arise, which may take away that business also....

But what are our children to do; are they to be brought up in idleness? Indeed as things are, it is no wonder to hear of so many executions; for our parts, though we may be thought illiterate men, our conceptions are, that bringing children up to industry, and keeping them employed, is the way to keep them from falling into those crimes, which an idle habit naturally leads to.

Questions:

1. What were the costs and benefits of the machines and new divisions of labor? Consider not just the product and the technology, but work location, labor force, consumption, class relations, etc.
2. What hopes and fears were expressed about the future of the new technology?
3. How have these hopes and fears materialized (or not) in the past 200 years? Are the hopes and fears still valid or not?
4. How are workers and manufacturers described and by whom? What conclusions can you draw from these descriptions?
5. How might these descriptions have shaped people's understanding? How might they have been shaped by ideas of the day (consider, for instance, Enlightenment ideas, see Chapter 18).
16.7 G. M. Trevelyan: Chapter XIII from *English Social History*

The historian G. M. Trevelyan (1876–1962) stressed the importance of the historian’s use of speculative imagination, the effort to bring the past to life through compelling storytelling based on all available evidence. In the extract from his *Social History of England* included here, Trevelyan explored the connection between the economic and cultural achievements of the eighteenth century.


If the England of the Eighteenth Century, under aristocratic leadership, was a land of art and elegance, its social and economic structure was assistant thereto. As yet there was no great development of factories, producing goods wholesale, ruining craftsmanship and taste, and rigidly dividing employers from employed. A large proportion of wage-earners were fine handicraftsman, often as well-educated, as well-to-do and socially as well considered as the small employer and shopkeeper.

Under these happy conditions, the skilled hands produced, for the ordinary market, goods of such beautiful design and execution that they are valued by connoisseurs and collectors today, china, glass and other ware, silver plate, books beautifully printed and bound, Chippendale chairs and cabinets, all sorts of articles for ornament and use. Even the commonest type of grandfather clocks that told the time in farmhouse kitchens, were simple and effective in design, the outcome of a tradition followed with individual variations by innumerable small firms.

Architecture was safe in the plain English style now known as ‘Georgian.’ In those days all buildings erected in town or country, from town halls and rural mansions to farms, cottages and garden tool-houses, were a pleasure to the eye, because the rules of proportion, in setting doors and windows in relation to the whole, were understood by common builders: those simple folk, by observing the rules of proportion laid down for their guidance in Gibbs’ handbooks, kept hold of a secret afterwards lost by the pretentious architects of the Victorian era, who deserted the plain English Georgian style to follow a hundred exotic fancies, Greek, mediaeval or what not and were book-wise in everything concerning their work, except the essential.

In the Eighteenth Century, art was a part of ordinary life and trade. The pictures of Hogarth, Gainsborough, Reynolds, Romney and Zoffany; the school of miniature portraits that culminated in Cosway; the engravings of Vertue and Woollett; the busts and statues of Roubillac; the furniture and decorations of the Adam brothers—these were not outbreaks of genius in protest against its surroundings, but the natural outcome of the ethos of the age, parts of a process of supply and demand. And the same may be said of the literary world of Gray, Goldsmith, Cowper, Johnson, Boswell and Burke. In its quiet, settled unity of aim and thought it was a classical age, unlike the vexed Victorian, when most of the great men—Carlyle, Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, the Preraphaelites, William Morris, Whistler, Browning and Meredith—were in a state of revolt against the debased ideals of their time, or were fighting baresark each to impose his own strange genius upon the public. Yet the Eighteenth Century, it is true, produced the greatest rebel of all: William Blake was born in 1757.

The spirit bloweth where it listeth: the social historian cannot pretend to explain why art or literature flourished at a particular period or followed a particular course. But he can point out certain general conditions favourable to a high level of taste and production in Dr. Johnson’s England.

Wealth and leisure were on the increase, widely diffused among large classes; civil peace and personal liberty were more secure than in any previous age; the limited liability of the wars we waged overseas with small professional armies gave very little disturbance to the peaceful avocations of the inhabitants of the fortunate island. Never was an Empire won at smaller cost than was ours in Canada and India. As to Australia, Captain Cook had merely to pick it up out of the sea (1770). Even the disastrous war in which we threw away the affections of the old American Colonies, though it caused a considerable disturbance in trade, otherwise affected but little the even tenor of life in the defeated country, because our hold on the sea, though challenged, was maintained; even when the French fleet for a while sailed the Channel (1779) it was not starvation but invasion that we had to fear, and the danger soon passed. And so it was again in the Napoleonic Wars. The fact that our island grew most of its own food and also commanded the paths of the ocean, was the dual basis ‘Of Britain’s calm felicity and power,’

which Wordsworth viewed with a just complacency, as he surveyed sea and land together from the summit of Black Comb, in the twentieth year of the War with Revolutionary France. One year of modern totalitarian war is more dislocating to society and more destructive of the higher branches of civilization in England, than a cycle of warfare in the days of the elder or the younger Pitt.
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But wealth and security cannot alone account for a great age of taste and art. The Victorian age was even more wealthy and even more secure; yet the houses it built and the things it put into them (except the books) were of no high order. In the Eighteenth Century, taste had not yet been vitiated by too much machine production. Both the maker and the purchaser of goods still thought in terms of handicraft. The artist and the manufacturer were not yet divided poles asunder. They were both men of a trade supplying a limited public, whose taste was still unspoiled because it had not yet seen much that was really bad. Life and art were still human not mechanical, and quality still counted far more than quantity.

Another circumstance favourable to the arts in the Hanoverian epoch was the aristocratic influence which coloured many aspects of life besides politics. The social aristocracy of that day included not only the great nobles but the squires, the wealthier clergy, and the cultivated middle class who consorted with them on familiar terms, as we read in Boswell’s Johnsonian dialogues, and in the life-history of the most princely of professional men, Sir Joshua Reynolds. That great society, broad-based on adequate numbers, and undisputed in its social privilege, could afford to look for quality in everything. The higher ranks of this aristocracy set the tone to the bourgeoisie and professional class, and they in return supplied the nobles with brains and ideas—as for instance Burke supplied Lord Rockingham. The leaders of the Eighteenth Century were not harassed by the perpetual itch to make money and yet more money, to produce more and yet more goods no matter of what sort, as were those mighty children of Mammon who in the Nineteenth Century set the tone to England, America and all the world. The aristocratic atmosphere was more favourable to art and taste than either the bourgeois or the democratic have since proved in England, or the totalitarian in Europe.

Indeed aristocracy functioned better as a patron of art and letters than even the old-fashioned form of Kingship. Monarchy may sometimes have taste, as in the France of Louis XIV and XV, but it concentrates everything at Court as the one acknowledged centre of light and leading. But the English aristocracy had not one centre but hundreds, scattered all over the country in ‘gentlemen’s seats’ and provincial towns, each of them a focus of learning and taste that more than made up for the decay of learning at the official Universities and of taste at the Hanoverian Court. George II patronized Handel’s music but nothing else. It did not matter, because patronage had passed into thousands of other hands—though not yet into the hands of millions. Oxford University did nothing for Gibbon, and Royalty had nothing to say to him except, “Hey, what Mr. Gibbon, scribble, scribble, scribble!” But the reading public of the day was just of the size and quality to give proper recognition to his greatness the moment his first volume appeared (1776).

Eighteenth Century taste was not perfect. The limits of its sympathy in literature are notorious. Even in art, too much, perhaps, was thought of Reynolds and not enough of Hogarth and Gainsborough. By the foundation of the Royal Academy in 1768 Sir Joshua made the purchase of pictures fashionable among the rising middle class seeking a hallmark of gentility. No doubt he thereby conferred a material benefit on his brother artists by creating a yet wider demand for their wares. But did that most noble knight unwittingly prepare the way for the vulgarization of art? And did his Royal Academy serve to stereotype over-much particular kinds of painting and sculpture?

The romantic circumstance of the discovery of the buried cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii excited an immense curiosity, which had better consequences, perhaps, for archaeology than for art. Graeco-Roman statuary of the second order was taken as the standard of judgment, and the next generation of Academy sculptors, Nollekens and Flaxman, insisted that all statues, even of contemporary British statesmen, must be moulded on that fashion, must be draped in the toga of the ancients (like the statue of Fox in Bloomsbury Square) and in other respects must cease to follow the true Renaissance tradition of Roubillac (died 1762). Oddly enough, at the very same time Benjamin West reversed this law of clothes as regards historical painting; in spite of the grave but friendly remonstrances of Sir Joshua himself, West insisted that his picture of the death of Wolfe (exhibited in the Academy of 1771) should show the general and his men in contemporary British uniform and not in ancient armour, as modern heroes in battle were wont to be painted for their greater renown. By his obstinacy in favour of this bold innovation, West won a charter of liberty for the school of historical painting which he founded, and which he made exceedingly popular especially through the medium of engravings.

But in spite of the vagaries of fashion in art and much variety in the powers of its leading practitioners, the tone of the Eighteenth Century was favourable to high quality in the arts and crafts. England was filled full of beautiful things of all kinds, old and new, native and foreign. Houses in town and country were as rich as museums and art galleries, but the books, the engravings, the china, the furniture, the pictures were not flaunted or crowded for exhibition, but were set in their natural places for domestic use in hospitable homes.

Indoors and out it was a lovely land. Man’s work still added more than it took away from the beauty of nature. Farm buildings and cottages of local style and material sank into the soft landscape, and harmoniously diversified and adorned it. The fields, enclosed by hedges of bramble and hawthorn set with tall elms, and the new ‘plantations’ of oak and beech, were a fair exchange for the bare open fields, the heaths and thickets of an earlier day. Nor indeed had all these disappeared. And near to almost every village was a manor-house park, with clumps of great trees under which the deer still browsed.
In the last decade of the century arose the great school of landscape painters, chiefly in water-colour—Girtin and the youthful Turner, soon to be followed by many more, including Crome and Cotman of the Norwich school, and Constable himself. They depicted England at her best, at the perfect moment before the outrages on her beauty began. In earlier years, the fashionable demand had been for portraits and subject pictures rather than for landscapes, in spite of the power in that line shown by Gainsborough and Richard Wilson. But all through the period there had been growing up a conscious admiration of scenery, of landscape in its broader outlines. It was reflected and stimulated by literature from the first appearance of Thomson’s *Seasons* in 1726, onwards through Cowper, till Wordsworth finally transformed and sublimated the theme. But no written word could express the unique glory of our island, which the painters alone could show, the shifting lights and shades of sky, earth and foliage in our water-laden atmosphere. Thus the joy of the English in their land received its expression in letters and in art, at the hands of Wordsworth and the landscape painters, just as the Eighteenth Century closed and the new era began.

As far back as the reign of George II, this novel delight and interest felt in the wilder and larger features of landscape had altered the fashion of laying out the ‘grounds’ of a country-house. The formal garden, the walks decorated by leaden statuettes in the Dutch style prevalent under William and Anne, and the yew hedges clipped into fantastic shapes, were swept away in order to bring the grass and trees of the park up to the walls of the manor house; the fruit and vegetable garden within its high brick walls, now regarded as an essential appendage of a country house, was placed at a little distance, out of sight of the front windows. These changes were conducted under the influence of William Kent and his successor ‘Capability Brown,’ so called from his habit of saying, when called in to consult on the new laying out of a gentleman’s grounds,

‘I see great capability of improvement here.’

No doubt there was loss as well as gain. It was sad that hundreds of those charming lead figures were cast away, to be melted down to shoot Americans and French. But the abolition of Dutch gardens to make room for grass slopes and trees visible from the windows, testified to the growing delight in natural scenery, which soon led Englishmen to take pleasure even in mountain forms, to flock to the Lake District, and in the following century to the Scottish Highlands and the Alps, hitherto abhorrent to civilized men.

This instinctive craving for the larger features of untamed nature was an inevitable reaction on the part of a society growing over-civilized. In older times forests and thickets were everywhere close at hand, and man was constantly at war with the wilderness; in those days he sought relief from the struggle in formal gardens. Now he had conquered. The countryside, though still beautiful, was tamed down to an affair of hedgerows and ‘plantations.’ So nature in her shaggy reality must be deliberately sought out further afield, in accordance with Rousseau’s mystic doctrines.

The taste for mountains which began in the latter part of the Eighteenth Century, was accompanied by a corresponding love for the ‘seaside,’ hitherto neglected. It is true that in the first half of the Century the new custom of resort to ‘seaside watering places’ had been medicinal in purpose. At the doctor’s orders people went to inhale the sea air at the village of Brightelmstone (Brighton), or drink the well-water at Scarborough, and even to dip in the waves. A picture of Scarborough beach in 1735 shows male visitors swimming: and at Margate by 1750 ‘Beale’s bathing machines,’ dragged by horses took either sex into the water, which they could enter down a ladder under cover of a hood, and thence if they wished swim out.

But those who went for the medicine of the body, found also a medicine of the soul. The contemplation of the sea and of coast scenery added an attraction which drew ever larger crowds to the cliffs and sands, primarily for health, but also for a mental pleasure that was a part of health. It is significant that in the latter part of George III’s reign the waves of the sea were, for the first time, being truly and lovingly delineated by Turner. Ships had been well painted before, but not the real waters on which they sailed. Poets had often before described the terrors the ocean; now they also described its beauty and exhorted it to roll on!

In the Eighteenth Century, for the first time, the sites of new country houses were chosen for aesthetic, not merely for practical reasons. They were often placed on rising ground to ‘command the prospect.’ This was rendered possible by the increasing control of the wealthy over artificial supplies of water. Cowper, who disapproved of ‘the great magician Brown,’ complained that the houses he induced people to build on exposed hill tops were very cold until trees had grown up to protect them, and that his landscape gardening cost so much as to ruin many of his more enthusiastic patrons (*The Task*, Book III). Certainly people tended to ‘overbuild’ themselves, and mortgaged their estates in their zeal for ‘improvement,’ like the last Earl Verney of Claydon.
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Fashion has many odd vagaries. A taste for artificial ruins preceded by many years the ‘Gothic revival’ in literature, religion and architecture. Before Pugin or Sir Walter Scott were born, and half a century before their influence was felt, ruined mediaeval castles were being erected as part of the ‘landscape,’ and fanciful ‘Gothic’ ornament was fastened on to some houses. But fortunately the mansions which the Eighteenth Century folk built for their own habitation were for the most part sound Georgian, sometimes with touches of the classical, such as porticos and pediments, which could however be made to blend not unnaturally with the Georgian style, itself of renaissance origin. The more pretentious were in the Palladian or some other style that the owner had observed on his Italian tour.

In these country houses, great and small, life was lived at its fullest. The zeal for estate management and agricultural improvement took the squire out on his horse at all hours of the day, and the ladies at home were as usefully employed, organizing and providing for their large households, and themselves busy with the needle or in the preserving room. For weeks and months together large parties of visitors were entertained with much eating and drinking, with field sports, with music and literature, with cards and dice which sometimes brought ruin to host or guest. It was usual now for a country house to have a library proportioned to its size, filled with leather-bound volumes stamped with the family crest—the English, Latin and Italian classics, and many large tomes of splendidly illustrated travels, local histories or books of engravings and prints. Twentieth Century civilization has nothing analogous to show to these private libraries.

In many respects it was a free-and-easy society. Charles Fox set the fashion of dressing carelessly. The House of Commons—the central point of the English aristocracy—produced the impression of déshabille on a foreign visitor in 1782:

‘The members have nothing particular in their dress; they even come into the House in their great coats and with boots and spurs. It is not at all uncommon to see a member lying stretched out on one of the benches, while others are debating. Some crack nuts, others eat oranges. There is no end to their going in and out; and as often as anyone wishes to go out, he places himself before the Speaker and makes him his bow, as if, like a schoolboy he asked his tutor’s permission.’ (Moritz, Travels, H. Milford, 1924, p. 53.)

Perhaps no set of men and women since the world began enjoyed so many different sides of life, with so much zest, as the English upper class at this period. The literary, the sporting, the fashionable and the political ‘sets’ were one and the same. When the most unsuccessful of all great politicians, Charles Fox, said on his deathbed that he had lived ‘happy,’ he spoke the truth. Oratory at its highest, politics at its keenest, long days of tramping after partridges, village cricket, endless talk as good as ever was talked, and a passion for Greek, Latin and English poetry and history—all these, and alas also the madness of the gambler, Fox had enjoyed and had shared with innumerable friends who loved him. Nor had he been less happy during the long wet day at Holkham which he spent sitting under a hedge, regardless of the rain, making friends with a ploughman who explained to him the mystery of the culture of turnips.

In versatility of action and enjoyment Fox represented the society in which he was so long the leading figure. All the activities of town and country, of public and private life, were pursued and relished by those liberal-minded, open-hearted aristocrats, whom their countrymen felt not the slightest wish to guillotine. The more fashionable among them had grave faults. In spite of the saying ‘as drunk as a lord,’ there is indeed ample evidence that excessive drinking was a habit among all classes of Englishmen low as well as high. But heavy gambling and connubial infidelity were perhaps most observable in the highest grade of society at that time, before the evangelical influence, having dealt first with the common-people, returned to lay a restraining hand on the upper class, fitting them for the ordeal of the Nineteenth Century, when their conduct would be canvassed and their privileges challenged. Meanwhile the hour was theirs and it was golden.

This classical age, when Dr. Johnson’s Dictionary (1755) did much to fix the words recognized as good English, saw also the settlement of spelling by rules now insisted on among all educated people. In the age of Marlborough, even queens and great generals spelt very much as they liked. But in 1750 Lord Chesterfield wrote to his son.

‘I must tell you that orthography, in the true sense of the word is so absolutely necessary for a man of letters, or a gentleman, that one false spelling may fix a ridicule upon him for the rest of his life. And I know a man of quality who never recovered the ridicule of having spelled wholesome without the w.’

---

1 Even before the building of the Gothic parts of Strawberry Hill begun by Horace Walpole in 1750, Gothic ornament in external and interior decoration of houses, of a very meretricious kind, was not unknown; it was followed by a taste for ‘Chinese’ motifs. But these fancies were exceptional. See Ketton-Creiner, Horace Walpole, pp. 151–154.
At the same time he advises the young man to read Plato, Aristotle, Demosthenes and Thucydides, whom none but adepts know, though many quote Homer. It is Greek, adds Chesterfield, that must distinguish a man; Latin alone will not. It is significant that the high-priest of fashion at that period when fashion meant so much, regarded classical scholarship of a very real kind as proper to the character of a gentleman.

**Question:**
1. What is the connection between aristocracy and art?
PART 17

Europe and the Americas in the Eighteenth Century

17.1 Slaves in the City

Slavery was also common in the cities and towns. Even relatively modest-income families had a slave or two to do menial labor, since such labor—“even carrying an umbrella or a package”—was considered beneath the dignity of a free person. The following are from newspaper want ads.


SALES

2. For sale a creole slave, a skilfull shoemaker, with a very good figure, about twenty years of age, with no vices or bad habits. His final price is 300$000 reis. Anyone interested in him should go to Travessa do Paço No. 11, upstairs, where he will find someone to speak to about the matter.

3. In Rua de Santa Teresa No. 36 a black man is now on sale, since his master is about to leave for Lisbon.

4. For sale, a black man of the Angola nation, about 20 to 25 years of age, a very good maker of combs, both tortoise shell and animal born. Anyone interested should go to Rua da Quitanda, corner of São Pedro, No. 50, where he will find someone to deal with....

6. Whoever would like to buy three native slave women from Angola, who have come recently from that place, one who irons and does laundry, another a baker and laundress, and the third also a laundress, all with very good figures and the ability to do every kind of work in the house, should contact Manoel do Nascimento da Mata, Rua Direita No. 54, first floor....

8. Whoever would like to buy a very good black cook and laundress, who also knows how to iron, is still young and without vices, should go to Rua dos Pescadores No. 80, where he will find someone to speak to....

PURCHASES

11. Whoever has a creole girl, well made, from six to eight years of age, and wishes to sell her, should contact Manoel do Nascimento da Mata, Rua Direita No. 54, first floor. He wishes to buy her to take her out of the country.

RENTALS

13. Whoever is interested in renting slaves well trained in the baker’s trade, who could even do every type of work in a house, should go to Rua dos Lateeiros, house No. 14, or to the textile shop on the Rua do Cano, almost at the cornor of Rua dos Lateeiros, facing house No. 51.

WET NURSES

16. Whoever would like to buy a black woman with milk, who can also cook and wash, should go to Rua do Senhor dos Passos, No. 35, opposite [the statue] of the same Senhor dos Passos....

Private Notices....

19. Whoever is interested in sending us any slave woman for training in ironing, sewing, and other accomplish- ments appropriate to a woman should direct himself to Rua São José, No. 69. In the same shop we mend silk stockings, do washing, every kind of sewing, and ironing is taken in at a reasonable price....

FOUND

34. Antonio José Telles, bush captain [capitão-do-mato], just arriving from Santa Cruz, has captured three black men from some thieves. Two acculturated Africans [ladinos] have been turned over to their owners, and a beardless boy newly arrived from Mozambique has been delivered to the jail for safekeeping, and I now make known to the public through this ad that his owner can see him at the jail.

35. On the 7th of the current month about ten o’clock in the morning two residents of Minas Geraias who stayed at the marshy encampment on the road to Minas and São Paulo found a black woman in an open hut and, suspecting her of being a runaway, took her with them and turned her over to Manoel Lopes Rodrigues Guimarães, a resident at the Carova ranch, in the new parish of Campo Grande. She says she is a Benguela and that her name is Maria. She is still not
very adapted to the country, but says her master is a mulatto named Alexandre, and that he lives in the Valongo. Her owner can find her in the aforementioned ranch, or look for her in the bakery in the Beco das Cancellas between Rua do Ouvidor and Rua do Rosario, where she will be sent. When a precise description of her has been given, she will be surrendered to her owner, once the expenses have been paid.

**ROBBERY**

36. A black man of the Benguela nation named Joaquim has run away, taking with him a display case containing wares. He has been going about the city as a peddler, with a license made out in the name of Isabel Esmeria, and the wares he has stolen belong to her, his mistress. He is believed to be selling his materials in various places protected by the license which he also took with him. Whoever knows anything about the stolen goods, or the black man, should notify his mistress, who will pay a reward for the trouble. It is suggested to anyone who inspects street peddlers’ licenses that if he should find this man in possession of that license he should have him arrested as a thief. It is also suggested that it will be easier to find him during daylight hours, and that the license will serve as evidence....

**RUNAWAY SLAVES**

40. It is now two months since a black creole woman named Candida from Mozambique ran away. She is tall, full-bodied, has long hair, and four spots or marks of her nation, one between the eyes, another on the chin, and one on each cheek. She has one slightly bent leg. Whoever brings her safely to Rua de Santo Antonio, No. 10, will receive the deserved reward.

41. A slave named Joaquim ran away in September of last year from Luis Manoel de Almeida Bastos. He is of the Benguela nation, practices the profession of cook, and was also a peddler. He is tall, ugly in the face, has a flat nose, with a scar in the corner of his left eye, and another on his lower lip close to the corner of his mouth, and he has, big flat feet. Anyone who has any information about him, and wishes to notify his above-mentioned, master, a resident at Caju Point in the house of Captain Manoel Joaquim Bacellar, will receive three doubloons as a reward.

42. On October 30, last, a black man named Narciso fled from house No. 19 of the Rua do Lavradio. He is a trained mason, still a boy of about 18, short, well-built, has large eyes, and a very sprightly and happy face; blue trousers of cotton gingham from Minas Gerais, also carried cotton trousers. It is believed that he goes about in the city suburbs working at his trade. Project supervisors and master masons are requested to check at their construction sites....

**Questions:**
The following questions pertain to documents 17.1 and 17.2.
1. What do we learn from these documents about slaves’ lives in the city and on the plantations?
2. How did racial mixing manifest itself politically and culturally in Brazil? How did this differ from the United States?
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17.2 Demands from a Slave Rebellion

The following proposal comes from a 1790 slave rebellion. Rather than accept this proposal, the authorities seized the rebels, sold many of the slaves to distant lands, and imprisoned for more than 16 years the leader Gregario Luis, probably the author of the slaves’ proposal.


LAW NO. 3353 OF MAY 13, 1888. DECLARES SLAVERY IN BRAZIL ABOLISHED

The Princess Imperial Regent, in the name of His Majesty the Emperor Dom Pedro II, makes known to all subjects of the Empire that the General Assembly has decreed, and she has sanctioned, the following law:

Art. 1. From the date of this law slavery is declared extinct in Brazil.
Art. 2. All provisions to the contrary are revoked.

She orders, therefore, all the authorities to whom the knowledge and execution of this Law belong to carry it out, and cause it to be fully and exactly executed and observed.

The Secretary of State for the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce and Public Works, and ad interim for Foreign Affairs, Bachelor Rodrigo Augusto da Silva, of the Council of His Majesty the Emperor, will have it printed, published, and circulated.

Given in the Palace of Rio de Janeiro on May 13, 1888, the 67th of Independence and of the Empire.

PRINCESS IMPERIAL REGENT
Rodrigo Augusto da Silva...

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 17.1 and 17.2.
1. What do we learn from these documents about slaves’ lives in the city and on the plantations?
2. How did racial mixing manifest itself politically and culturally in Brazil? How did this differ from the United States?
17.3 The Stamp Act: “Unconstitutional and Unjust”

Benjamin Franklin is being questioned in the English Parliament about the American colonies’ perceptions of the Stamp Act (1765)—an act that said the colonies had to purchase a stamp for each publication and legal document in order to help pay the costs of the English government’s defense of the colonies. The Stamp Act was repeated in 1766, but Parliament claimed the right to legislate for the colonies “in all cases whatsoever.” Thus, the disagreement continued.


THE EXAMINATION OF DOCTOR BENJAMIN FRANKLIN... IN THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS, RELATIVE TO THE REPEAL OF THE AMERICAN STAMP ACT...

[February, 1766]

Q. What is your name, and place of abode?
A. Franklin, of Philadelphia....

Q. From the thinness of the back settlements, would not the stamp act be extremely inconvenient to the inhabitants, if executed?
A. To be sure it would; as many of the inhabitants could not get stamps when they had occasion for them without taking long journeys, and spending perhaps Three or Four Pounds, that the Crown might get Six pence.

Q. Are not the Colonies, from their circumstances, very able to pay the stamp duty?
A. In my opinion there is not gold and silver enough in the Colonies to pay the stamp duty for one year.

Q. Don’t you know that the money arising from the stamps was all to be laid out in America?
A. I know it is appropriated by the act to the American service; but it will be spent in the conquered Colonies, where the soldiers are, not in the Colonies that pay it.

Q. Is there not a balance of trade due from the Colonies where the troops are posted, that will bring back the money to the old colonies?
A. I think not. I believe very little would come back. I know of no trade likely to bring it back. I think it would come from the Colonies where it was spent directly to England; for I have always observed, that in every Colony the more plenty the means of remittance to England, the more goods are sent for, and the more trade with England carried on....

Q. Do you think the people of America would submit to pay the stamp duty, if it was moderated?
A. No, never, unless compelled by force of arms....

Q. What was the temper of America towards Great Britain before the year 1763?
A. The best in the world. They submitted willingly to the government of the Crown, and paid, in all their courts, obedience to acts of parliament. Numerous as the people are in the several provinces, they cost you nothing in forts, citadels, garrisons, or armies, to keep them in subjection. They are governed by this country at the expense only of a little pen, ink and paper. They were led by a thread. They had not only a respect, but an affection for Great-Britain; for its laws, its customs and manners, and even a fondness for its fashions, that greatly increased the commerce. Natives of Britain were always treated with particular regard; to be an Old-England man was, of itself, a character of some respect, and gave a kind of rank among us.

Q. And what is their temper now?
A. O, very much altered.

Q. Did you ever hear the authority of parliament to make laws for American questioned till lately?
Part 17: Europe and the Americas in the Eighteenth Century

A. The authority of Parliament was allowed to be valid in all laws, except such as should lay internal taxes. It was never disputed in laying duties to regulate commerce.

Q. In what light did the people of America use to consider the parliament of Great-Britain?
A. They considered the parliament as the great bulwark and security of their liberties and privileges, and always spoke of it with the utmost respect and veneration. Arbitrary ministers, they thought, might possibly, at times, attempt to oppress them; but they relied on it, that the parliament, on application, would always give redress. They remembered, with gratitude, a strong instance of this, when a bill was brought into parliament, with a clause, to make royal instructions laws in the colonies, which the House of Commons would not pass, and it was thrown out.

Q. And have they not still the same respect for parliament?
A. No, it is greatly lessened.

Q. To what causes is that owing?
A. To a concurrence of causes; the restraints lately laid on their trade, by which the bringing of foreign gold and silver into the Colonies was prevented; the prohibition of making paper money among themselves; and then demanding a new and heavy tax by stamps; taking away, at the same time, trials by juries, and refusing to receive and hear their humble petitions.

Q. Don’t you think they would submit to the stamp-act, if it was modified, the obnoxious parts taken out, and the duty reduced to some particulars, of small moment?
A. No; they will never submit to it.

Q. What is your opinion of a future tax, imposed on the same principle with that of the stamp-act? How would the Americans receive it?
A. Just as they do this. They would not pay it.

Q. Have not you heard of the resolutions of this House, and of the House of Lords, asserting the right of parliament relating to America, including a power to tax the people there?
A. Yes, I have heard of such resolutions.

Q. What will be the opinion of the Americans on those resolutions?
A. They will think them unconstitutional and unjust.

Q. Was it an opinion in America before 1763, that the parliament had no right to lay taxes and duties there?
A. I never heard any objection to the right of laying duties to regulate commerce; but a right to lay internal taxes was never supposed to be in parliament, as we are not represented there.

Q. Can any thing less than a military force carry the stamp act into execution?
A. I do not see how a military force can be applied to the purpose.

Q. Why may it not?
A. Suppose a military force sent into America, they will find nobody in arms; what are they then to do? They cannot force a man to take stamps who chuses to do without them. They will not find a rebellion; they may in deed make one.

Q. If the act is not repealed, what do you think will be in the consequences?
A. A total loss of the respect and affection the people of America bear to this country, and of all the commerce that depends on that respect and affection.

Q. How can the commerce be affected?
A. You will find, that if the act is not repealed, they will take very little of your manufacturers in a short time.

Q. Is it in their power to do without them?
A. I think they may very well do without them....
Q. Don’t you know, that there is, in the Pennsylvania charter, an express reservation of the right of parliament to lay taxes there?
A. I know there is a clause in the charter, by which the King grants, that he will levy no taxes on the inhabitants, unless it be with the consent of the assembly, or by act of parliament.
Q. How, then, could the assembly of Pennsylvania assert, that laying a tax on them by the stamp act was an infringement of their rights?
A. They understand it thus; by the same charter, and otherwise, they are entitled to all the privileges and liberties of Englishmen; they find in the great charters, and the petition and declaration of rights, that one of the privileges of English subjects is, that they are not to be taxed but by their common consent; they have therefore replied upon it, from the first settlement of the province, that the parliament never would, nor could, by colour of that clause in the charter, assume a right of taxing them, till it had qualified itself to exercise such right, by admitting representatives from the people to be taxed, who ought to make a part of that common consent.
Q. Are there any words in the chapter that justify that construction?
A. “The common rights of Englishmen,” as declared by Magna Charta, and the petition of right, all justify it.
Q. Does the distinction between internal and external taxes exist in the words of the charter?
A. No, I believe not.
Q. Then, may they not, by the same interpretation, object to the parliament’s right of external taxation?
A. They never have hitherto. Many arguments have been lately used here to shew them, that there is no difference, and that, if you have no right to tax them internally, you have none to tax them externally, or make any other law to bind them. At present they do not reason so; but in time they may possibly be convinced by these arguments....
Q. What used to be the pride of the Americans?
A. To indulge in the fashions and manufacturers of Great Britain.
Q. What is now their pride?
A. To wear their old cloaths over again, till they can make new ones.

Questions:
1. What is proclaimed or desired in this document?
2. What is the basis for the statement of rights?
3. How are these rights interpreted by the group?
17.4 “Declaration of Sentiments”: American Women Want Independence Too

Throughout the nineteenth century, women participated alongside men in the anti-slavery movement. However, they were not always treated equally. One example of this was in 1840, when a group of American women who traveled to England to participate in the London Antislavery Convention found themselves barred from the Convention. This and other such experiences led a small group of mostly Quaker women to a meeting in Seneca Falls. They met in July 1848, a year of revolutions throughout Europe, and proclaimed the “Declaration of Sentiments.”


When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one portion of the family of man to assume among the people of the earth a position different from that which they have hitherto occupied, but one to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes that impel them to such a course.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of those who suffer from it to refuse allegiance to it, and to insist upon the institution of a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they were accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of the women under this government, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to demand the equal station to which they are entitled.

The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.

He has compelled her to submit to laws, in the formation of which she had no voice.

He has withheld from her rights which are given to the most ignorant and degraded men—both natives and foreigners.

Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the elective franchise, thereby leaving her without representation in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all sides.

He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.

He has taken from her all right in property, even to the wages she earns.

He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as she can commit many crimes with impunity, provided they be done in the presence of her husband. In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes, her master—the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement.

He has so framed the laws of divorce, as to when shall be the proper causes, and in case of separation, to whom the guardianship of the children shall be given, as to be wholly regardless of the happiness of women—the law, in all cases, going upon a false supposition of the supremacy of man, and giving all power into his hands.

After depriving her of all rights as a married woman, if single, and the owner of property, he has taxed her to support a government which recognizes her only when her property can be made profitable to it.

He has monopolized nearly all the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty remuneration. He closes against her all the avenues to wealth and distinction which he considers most honorable to himself. As a teacher of theology, medicine, or law, she is not known.
He has denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed against her.
He allows her in Church, as well as State, but a subordinate position, claiming Apostolic authority for her exclusion from the ministry, and, with some exceptions, from any public participation in the affairs of the Church.
He has created a false public sentiment by giving to the world a different code of morals for men and women, by which moral delinquencies which exclude women from society, are not only tolerated, but deemed of little account in man.
He has usurped the prerogative of Jehovah himself, claiming it as his right to assign for her a sphere of action, when that belongs to her conscience and to her God.
He has endeavored, in every way that he could, to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life.
Now, in view of this entire disfranchisement of one-half the people of this country, their social and religious degradation—in view of the unjust laws above mentioned, and because women do feel themselves aggrieved, oppressed, and fraudulently deprived of their most sacred rights, we insist that they have immediate admission to all the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the United States.
In entering upon the great work before us, we anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation, and ridicule; but we shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our object. We shall employ agents, circulate tracts, petition the State and National legislatures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press in our behalf. We hope this Convention will be followed by a series of Conventions embracing every part of the country.
The following resolutions were discussed by Lucretia Mott, Thomas and Mary Ann McClintock, Amy Post, Catharine A. F. Stebbins, and others, and were adopted:

WHEREAS, The great precept of nature is conceded to be, that “man shall pursue his own true and substantial happiness.” Blackstone in his Commentaries remarks, that this law of Nature being coeval with man-kind, and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this, and such of them as are valid, derive all their force, and all their validity, and all their authority, mediately and immediately, from this original; therefore;

Resolved, That such laws as conflict, in any way, with the true and substantial happiness of woman, are contrary to the great precept of nature and of no validity, for this is “superior in obligation to any other.”

Resolved, That all laws which prevent woman from occupying such a station in society as her conscience shall dictate, or which place her in a position inferior to that of man, are contrary to the great precept of nature, and therefore of no force or authority.

Resolved, That woman is man’s equal—was intended to be so by the Creator, and the highest good of the race demands that she should be recognized as such.

Resolved, That the women of this country ought to be enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live, that they may no longer publish their degradation by declaring themselves satisfied with their present position, nor their ignorance by asserting that they have all the rights they want.

Resolved, That inasmuch as man, while claiming for himself intellectual superiority, does accord to woman moral superiority, it is preeminently his duty to encourage her to speak and teach, as she has an opportunity, in all religious assemblies.

Resolved, That the same amount of virtue, delicacy, and refinement of behavior that is required of woman in the social state, should also be required of man, and the same transgressions should be visited with equal severity on both man and woman.

Resolved, That the objection of indelicacy and impropriety, which is so often brought against woman when she addresses a public audience, comes with a very ill-grace from those who encourage, by their attendance, her appearance on the stage, in the concert, or in feats of the circus.

Resolved, That woman has too long rested satisfied in the circumscribed limits which corrupt customs and a perverted application of the Scriptures have marked out for her, and that it is time she should move in the enlarged sphere which her great Creator has assigned her.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise.

Resolved, That the equality of human rights results necessarily from the fact of the identity of the race in capabilities and responsibilities.
Resolved, therefore, That being invested by the Creator with the same capabilities, and the same consciousness of responsibility for their exercise, it is demonstrably the right and duty of woman, equally with man, to promote every righteous cause by every righteous means; and especially in regard to the great subjects of morals and religion, it is self-evidently her right to participate with her brother in teaching them, both in private and in public, by writing and by speaking, by any instrumentalities proper to be used, and in any assemblies proper to be held; and this being a self-evident truth growing out of the divinely implanted principles of human nature, any custom or authority adverse to it, whether modern or wearing the hoary sanction of antiquity, is to be regarded as a self-evident falsehood, and at war with mankind.

At the last session Lucretia Mott offered and spoke to the following resolution:

Resolved, That the speedy success of our cause depends upon the zealous and untiring efforts of both men and women, for the overthrow of the monopoly of the pulpit, and for the securing to woman an equal participation with men in the various trades, professions, and commerce.

Questions:
1. What is proclaimed or desired in this document?
2. What is the basis for the statement of rights?
3. How are these rights interpreted by the group?
17.5 Thomas Paine: from *Common Sense*

Thomas Paine (1737–1809) arrived in America in 1774, after having been forced out of his job as an excise officer for leading a campaign for higher wages. An acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin, who he first met in England, Paine wrote a series of pamphlets espousing the cause of American independence. The most famous, excerpted here, was entitled *Common Sense*.


Here then is the origin and rise of government; namely, a mode tendered necessary by the inability of moral virtue to govern the world; here too is the design and end of government, viz. freedom and security. And however our eyes may be dazzled with snow, or our ears deceived by sound; however prejudice may warp our wills, or interest darken our understanding, the simple voice of nature and of reason will say, it is right.

I draw my idea of the form of government from a principle in nature, which no art can overturn, viz. that the more simple any thing is, the less liable it is to be disordered, and the easier repaired when disordered; and with this maxim in view, I offer a few remarks on the so much boasted constitution of England. That it was noble for the dark and slavish times in which it was erected is granted. When the world was over-run with tyranny the least remove therefrom was a glorious rescue. But that it is imperfect, subject to convulsions, and incapable of producing what it seems to promise, is easily demonstrated.

Absolute governments (tho’ the disgrace of human nature) have this advantage with them, that they are simple; if the people suffer, they know the head from which their suffering springs, know likewise the remedy, and are not bewildered by a variety of causes and cures. But the constitution of England is so exceedingly complex, that the nation may suffer for years together without being able to discover in which part the fault lies, some will say in one and some in another, and every political physician will advise a different medicine.

I know it is difficult to get over local or long standing prejudices, yet if we will suffer ourselves to examine the component parts of the English constitution, we shall find them to be the base remains of two ancient compounded with some new republican materials.

*First.*—The remains of monarchical tyranny in the person of the king.

*Secondly.*—The remains of aristocratical tyranny in the persons of the peers.

*Thirdly.*—The new republican materials, in the persons of the commons, on whose virtue depends the freedom of England.

The two first, by being hereditary, are independent of the people; wherefore in a *constitutional sense* they contribute nothing towards the freedom of the state.

To say that the constitution of England is a *union* of three powers reciprocally *checking* each other, is farcical, either the words have no meaning, or they are flat contradictions.

To say that the commons is a check upon the king, presupposes two things.

*First.*—That the king is not to be trusted without being looked after, or in other words, that a thirst for absolute power is the natural disease of monarchy.

*Secondly.*—That the commons, by being appointed for that purpose, are either wiser or more worthy of confidence than the crown.

But as the same constitution which gives the commons a power to check the king by withholding the supplies, gives afterwards the king a power to check the commons, by empowering him to reject their other bills; it again supposes that the king is wiser than those whom it has already supposed to be wiser than him. A mere absurdity!

There is something exceedingly ridiculous in the composition of monarchy; it first excludes a man from the means of information, yet empowers him to act in cases where the highest judgment is required. The state of a king shuts him from the world, yet the business of a king requires him to know it thoroughly; wherefore the different parts, unnaturally opposing and destroying each other, prove the whole character to be absurd and useless.

Some writers have explained the English constitution thus: the king, say they, is one, the people another; the peers are an house in behalf of the king; the commons in behalf of the people; but this hath all the distinctions of an house divided against itself; and though the expressions be pleasantly arranged, yet when examined they appear idle and ambiguous; and it will always happen, that the nicest construction that words are capable of, when applied to the description of some thing which either cannot exist, or is too incomprehensible to be within the compass of description, will be words of sound only, and though they may amuse the ear, they cannot inform the mind, for this, explanation includes a previous question, viz. *How came the king by a power which the people are afraid to trust, and always obliged to check?* Such a power could not be the gift of a wise people, neither can any power, *which needs checking*, be from God; yet the provision, which the constitution makes, supposes such a power to exist.
But the provision is unequal to the task; the means either cannot or will not accomplish the end, and the whole affair is a *felo de se*; for as the greater weight will always carry up the less, and as all the wheels of a machine are put in motion by one, it only remains to know which power in the constitution has the most weight, for that will govern; and though the others, or a part of them, may clog, or, as the phrase is, check the rapidity of its motion, yet so long as they cannot stop it, their endeavours will be ineffectual; the first moving power will at last have its way, and what it wants in speed is supplied by time.

That the crown is this overbearing part in the English constitution needs not be mentioned, and that it derives its whole consequence merely from being the giver of places and pensions is self-evident, wherefore, though we have been wise enough to shut and lock a door against absolute monarchy, we at the same time leave been foolish enough to put the crown in possession of the key.

The prejudice of Englishmen, in favour of their own government by king, lords, and commons, arises as much or more from national pride than reason. Individuals are undoubtedly safer in England than in some other countries, but the will of the king is as much the law of the land in Britain as in France, with this difference, that instead of proceeding directly from his mouth, it is handed to the people under the most formidable shape of an act of eat. For the fate of Charles the First, hath only made kings more subtle—not more just.

Wherefore, laying aside all national pride and prejudice in favour of modes and forms, the plain truth is, that it is wholly owing to the constitution of the people, and not to the constitution of the government that the crown is not as oppressive in England as in Turkey.

An inquiry into the constitutional errors in the English form of government is at this time highly necessary; for as we are never in a proper condition of doing justice to others, while we continue under the influence of some leading partiality, so neither are we capable of doing it to ourselves while we remain fettered by any obstinate prejudice. And as a man, who is attached to a prostitute, is unfitted to choose or judge of a wife, so any prepossession in favour of a rotten constitution of government will disable us from discerning a good one.

**Question:**
1. What are the inherent contradictions of the English Constitution according to Paine?
My dear Sir,

If I was equal to the task of forming a plan for the government of a colony, I should be flattered with your request, and very happy to comply with it; because, as the divine science of politics is the science of social happiness, and the blessings of society depend entirely on the constitutions of government, which are generally institutions that last for many generations, there can be no employment more agreeable to a benevolent mind than a research after the best.

Pope flattered tyrants too much when he said,

“For forms of government let fools contest, That which is best administered is best.”

Nothing can be more fallacious than this. But poets read history to collect flowers, not fruits; they attend to fanciful images, not the effects of social institutions. Nothing is more certain, from the history of nations and nature of man, than that some forms of government are better fitted for being well administered than others.

We ought to consider what is the end of government, before we determine which is the best form. Upon this point all speculative politicians will agree, that the happiness of society is the end of government, as all divines and moral philosophers will agree that the happiness of the individual is the end of man. From this principle it will follow, that the form of government which communicates ease, comfort, security, or, in one word, happiness, to the greatest number of persons, and in the greatest degree, is the best.

All sober inquirers after truth, ancient and modern, pagan and Christian, have declared that the happiness of man, as well as his dignity, consists in virtue. Confucius, Zoroaster, Socrates, Mahomet, not to mention authorities really sacred, have agreed in this.

If there is a form of government, then, whose principle and foundation is virtue, will not every sober man acknowledge it better calculated to promote the general happiness than any other form?

Fear is the foundation of most governments; but it is so sordid and brutal a passion, and renders men in whose breasts it predominates so stupid and miserable, that Americans will not be likely to approve of any political institution which is founded on it.

Honor is truly sacred, but holds a lower rank in the scale of moral excellence than virtue. Indeed, the former is but a part of the latter, and consequently has not equal pretensions to support a frame of government productive of human happiness.

The foundation of every government is some principle or passion in the minds of the people. The noblest principles and most generous affections in our nature, then, have the fairest chance to support the noblest and most generous models of government.

A man must be indifferent to the sneers of modern Englishmen, to mention in their company the names of Sidney, Harrington, Locke, Milton, Nedham, Neville, Burnet, and Hoadly. No small fortitude is necessary to confess that one has read them. The wretched condition of this country, however, for ten or fifteen years past, has frequently reminded me of their principles and reasonings. They will convince any candid mind, that there is no good government but what is republican. That the only valuable part of the British constitution is so; because the very definition of a republic is “an empire of laws, and not of men.” That, as a republic is the best of governments, so that particular arrangement of the powers of society, or, in other words, that form of government which is best contrived to secure an impartial and exact execution of the laws, is the best of republics.

Of republics there is an inexhaustible variety, because the possible combinations of the powers of society are capable of innumerable variations.

As good government is an empire of laws, how shall your laws be made? In a large society, inhabiting an extensive country, it is impossible that the whole should assemble to make laws. The first necessary step, then, is to depute power from the many to a few of the most wise and good. But by what rules shall you choose your representatives? Agree upon the number and qualifications of persons who shall have the benefit of choosing, or annex this privilege to the inhabitants of a certain extent of ground.

The principle difficulty lies, and the greatest care should be employed in constituting this representative assem-
bly, It should be in miniature an exact portrait of the people at large. It should think, feel, reason and act like them. That it may be the interest of this assembly to do strict justice at all times, it should be an equal representation, or, in other words, equal interests among the people should have equal interests in it. Great care should be taken to effect this, and to prevent unfair, partial, and corrupt elections. Such regulations, however, may be better made in times of greater tranquility than the present; and they will spring up themselves naturally, when all the powers of government come to be in the hands of the people’s friends. At present, it will be safest to proceed in all established modes, to which the people have been familiarized by habit.

A representation of the people in one assembly being obtained, a question arises, whether all the powers of government, legislative, executive, and judicial, shall be left in this body? I think a people cannot be long free, nor ever happy, whose government is in one assembly. My reasons for this opinion are as follow:—

1. A single assembly is liable to all the vices, follies, and frailties of an individual; subject to fits of humor, starts of passion, flights of enthusiasm, partialities, or prejudice, and consequently productive of hasty results and absurd judgments. And all these errors ought to be corrected and defects supplied by some controlling power.

2. A single assembly is apt to be avaricious, and in time will not scruple to exempt itself from burdens, which it will lay, without compunction, on its constituents.

3. A single assembly is apt to grow ambitious, and after a time will not hesitate to vote itself perpetual. This was one fault of the Long Parliament; but more remarkably of Holland, whose assembly first voted themselves from annual to septennial, then for life, and after a course of years, that all vacancies happening by death or otherwise, should be filled by themselves, without any application to constituents at all.

4. A representative assembly, although extremely well qualified, and absolutely necessary, as a branch of the legislative, is unfit to exercise the executive power, for want of two essential properties, secrecy and despatch.

5. A representative assembly is still less qualified for the judicial power, because it is too numerous, too slow, and too little skilled in the laws.

6. Because a single assembly, possessed of all the powers of government, would make arbitrary laws for their own interest, execute all laws arbitrarily for their own interest, and adjudge all controversies in their own favor.

But shall the whole power of legislation rest in one assembly? Most of the foregoing reasons apply equally to prove that the legislative power ought to be more complex; to which we may add, that if the legislative power is wholly in one assembly, and the executive in another, or in a single person, these two powers will oppose and encroach upon each other, until the contest shall end in war, and the whole power, legislative and executive, be usurped by the strongest.

The judicial power, in such case, could not mediate, or hold the balance between the two contending powers, because the legislative would undermine it. And this shows the necessity, too, of giving the executive power a negative upon the legislative, otherwise this will be continually encroaching upon that.

To avoid these dangers, let a distinct assembly be constituted, as a mediator between the two extreme branches of the legislature, that which represents the people, and that which is vested with the executive power.

Let the representative assembly then elect by ballot, from among themselves or their constituents, or both, a distinct assembly, which, for the sake of perspicuity, we will call a council. It may consist of any number you please, say twenty or thirty, and should have a free and independent exercise of its judgment, and consequently a negative voice in the legislature.

These two bodies, thus constituted, and made integral parts of the legislature, let them unite, and by joint ballot choose a governor, who, after being stripped of most of those badges of domination, called prerogatives, should have a free and independent exercise of his judgment, and be made also an integral part of the legislature. This, I know, is liable to objections; and, if you please, you may make him only president of the council, as in Connecticut. But as the governor is to be invested with the executive power, with consent of council, I think he ought to have a negative upon the legislative. If he is annually elective, as he ought to be, he will always have so much reverence and affection for the people, their representatives and counsellors, that, although you give him an independent exercise of his judgment, he will seldom use it in opposition to the two houses, except in cases the public utility of which would be conspicuous; and some such cases would happen.

In the present exigency of American affairs, when, by an act of Parliament, we are put out of the royal protection, and consequently discharged from our allegiance, and it has become necessary to assume government for our immediate security, the governor, lieutenant-governor, secretary, treasurer, commissary, attorney-general, should be chosen by joint ballot of both houses. And these and all other elections, especially of representatives and counsellors, should be annual, there not being in the whole circle of the sciences a maxim more infallible than this, “where annual elections end, there slavery begins.”

These great men, in this respect, should be, once a year,

“Like bubbles on the sea of matter borne, They rise, they break, and to that sea return.”
This will teach them the great political virtues of humility, patience, and moderation, without which every man in power becomes a ravenous beast of prey.

This mode of constituting the great offices of state will answer very well for the present; but if by experiment it should be found inconvenient, the legislature may, at its leisure, devise other methods of creating them, by elections of the people at large, as in Connecticut, or it may enlarge the term for which they shall be chosen to seven years, or three years, or for life, or make any other alterations which the society shall find productive of its ease, its safety, its freedom, or, in one word, its happiness.

A rotation of all offices, as well as of representatives and counsellors, has many advocates, and is contended for with many plausible arguments. It would be attended, no doubt, with many advantages; and if the society has a sufficient number of suitable characters to supply the great number of vacancies which would be made by such a rotation, I can see no objection to it. These persons may be allowed to serve for three years, and then be excluded three years, or for any longer or shorter term.

Any seven or nine of the legislative council may be made a quorum, for doing business as a privy council, to advise the governor in the exercise of the executive branch of power, and in all acts of state.

The governor should have the command of the militia and of all your armies. The power of pardons should be with the governor and council.

Judges, justices, and all other officers, civil and military, should be nominated and appointed by the governor, with the advice and consent of council, unless you choose to have a government more popular; if you do, all officers, civil and military, may be chosen by joint ballot of both houses; or, in order to preserve the independence and importance of each house, by ballot of one house, concurred in by the other. Sheriffs should be chosen by the freeholders of counties; so should registers of deeds and clerks of counties.

All officers should have commissions, under the hand of the governor and seal of the colony.

The dignity and stability of government in all its branches, the morals of the people, and every blessing of society depend so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice, that the judicial power ought to be distinct from both the legislative and executive, and independent upon both, that so it may be a check upon both, as both should be checks upon that. The judges, therefore, should be always men of learning and experience in the laws, of exemplary morals, great patience, calmness, coolness, and attention. Their minds should not be distracted with jarring interests; they should not be dependent upon any man, or body of men. To these ends, they should hold estates for life in their offices; or, in other words, their commissions should be during good behavior, and their salaries ascertained and established by law. For misbehavior, the grand inquest of the colony, the house of representatives, should impeach them before the governor and council, where they should have time and opportunity to make their defence; but, if convicted, should be removed from their offices, and subjected to such other punishment as shall be proper.

A militia law, requiring all men, or with very few exceptions besides cases of conscience, to be provided with arms and ammunition, to be trained at certain seasons; and requiring counties, towns, or other small districts, to be provided with public stocks of ammunition and entrenching utensils, and with some settled plans for transporting provisions after the militia, when marched to defend their country against sudden invasions; and requiring certain districts to be provided with field-pieces, companies of matrosses, and perhaps some regiments of light-horse, is always a wise institution, and, in the present circumstances of our country, indispensable.

Laws for liberal education of youth, especially of the lower class of people, are so extremely wise and useful, that, to a humane and generous mind, no expense for this purpose would be thought extravagant.

The very mention of sumptuary laws will excite a smile. Whether our countrymen have wisdom and virtue enough to submit to them, I know not; but the happiness of the people might be greatly promoted by them, and a revenue saved sufficient to carry on this war forever. Frugality is a great revenue, besides curing us of vanities, levities, and fopperies, which are real antidotes to all great, manly, and warlike virtues.

But must not all commissions run in the name of a king? No. Why may they not as well run thus, “The colony of to A. B. greeting;” and be tested by the governor?

Why may not writs, instead of running in the name of the king, run thus, “The colony of to the sheriff,” &c., and be tested by the chief justice?

Why may not indictments conclude, “against the peace of the colony of and the dignity of the same?”

A constitution founded on these principles introduces knowledge among the people, and inspires them with a conscious dignity becoming freemen; a general emulation takes place, which causes good humor, sociability, good manners, and good morals to be general. That elevation of sentiment inspired by such a government, makes the common people brave and enterprising. That ambition which is inspired by it makes them sober, industrious, and frugal. You will find among them some elegance, perhaps, but more solidity; a little pleasure, but a great deal of business; some politeness, but more civility. If you compare such a country with the regions of domination, whether monarchical or aristocratical, you will fancy yourself in Arcadia or Elysium.
If the colonies should assume governments separately, they should be left entirely to their own choice of the forms; and if a continental constitution should be formed, it should be a congress, containing a fair and adequate representation of the colonies, and its authority should sacredly be confined to those cases, namely, war, trade, disputes between colony and colony, the post-office, and the unappropriated lands of the crown, as they used to be called.

These colonies, under such forms of government, and in such a union, would be unconquerable by all the monarchies of Europe.

You and I, my dear friend, have been sent into life at a time when the greatest lawgivers of antiquity would have wished to live. How few of the human race have ever enjoyed an opportunity of making an election of government, more than of air, soil, or climate, for themselves or their children! When, before the present epocha, had three millions of people full power and a fair opportunity to form and establish the wisest and happiest government that human wisdom can contrive? I hope you will avail yourself and your country of that extensive learning and indefatigable industry which you possess, to assist her in the formation of the happiest governments and the best character of a great people. For myself, I must beg you to keep my name out of sight; for this feeble attempt, if it should be known to be mine, would oblige me to apply to myself those lines of the immortal John Milton, in one of his sonnets:—

“I did but prompt the age to quit their clogs
By the known rules of ancient liberty,
When straight a barbarous noise environs me
Of owls and cuckoos, asses, apes, and dogs.”

**Question:**
1. To what degree does Adams’ plan resemble the eventual American Constitution? What are some differences?
John Locke (1632–1704) laid the foundation for Enlightenment philosophy and political theory. Locke’s belief in the virtue of the middle class, the goodness of humanity, and possibility of human improvement all marked the thought of later Enlightenment figures. In the excerpt included here, Locke argued that all ideas are learned and not innate.

NO INNATE SPECULATIVE PRINCIPLES

1. It is an established opinion amongst some men, that there are in the understanding certain innate principles; some primary notions, κοιναὶ εννοιαι, characters, as it were stamped upon the mind of man; which the soul receives it is very first being, and brings into the world with it. It would be sufficient to convince unprejudiced readers of the falsehood of this supposition, if I should only show (as I hope I shall in the following parts of this Discourse) how men, barely by the use of their natural faculties, may attain to all the knowledge they have, without the help of any innate impressions; and may arrive at certainty, without any such original notions or principles. For I imagine any one will easily grant that it would be impertinent to suppose the ideas of colours innate in a creature to whom God hath given sight, and a power to receive them by the eyes from external objects: and no less unreasonable would it be to attribute several truths to the impressions of nature, and innate characters, when we may observe in ourselves faculties fit to attain as easy and certain knowledge of them as if they were originally imprinted on the mind.

But because a man is not permitted without censure to follow his own thoughts in the search of truth, when they lead him ever so little out of the common road, I shall set down the reasons that made me doubt of the truth of that opinion, as an excuse for my mistake, if I be in one; which I leave to be considered by those who, with me, dispose themselves to embrace truth wherever they find it.

2. There is nothing more commonly taken for granted than that there are certain principles, both speculative and practical, (for they speak of both), universally agreed upon by all mankind: which therefore, they argue, must needs be the constant impressions which the souls of men receive in their first beings, and which they bring into the world with them, as necessarily and really as they do any of their inherent faculties.

---

1 Locke does not name the ‘men’ of ‘innate principles’ whose ‘opinion’ he proceeds to criticize; nor does he quote their words in evidence of what they intended by the opinion. He says (ch. ii. § 15) that after he had argued out objections to the ‘established opinion,’ his attention was directed to the arguments in its defence in the De Veritate of Lord Herbert, which thereupon he proceeds to controvert. From the first, Descartes, with whose writings he was early familiar, was probably in his view. According to Descartes there are three sources of ideas: ‘Entre ces idées, les unes semblent être nées avec moi; les autres être étrangères et venir de dehors; et les autres être faites et inventées par moi-même.’ (Méd. iii. 7.) But even the ‘idées nées avec moi’ of Descartes were not regarded by him as in consciousness until ‘experience’ had evoked them from latency—a position which Locke’s argument always fails to reach. Though Locke nowhere names More, Hale, or Cudworth, he might have found expressions of theirs which, on a superficial view, appear to countenance the sort of innateness which he attributes to the ‘established opinion.’ See Hume’s Inquiry concerning Human Understanding, in Note A, on ‘innate ideas,’ and Locke’s ‘loose sense of the world idea.’

2 The impossibility of resolving the intellectual necessities, which govern and constitute knowledge and existence, into transitory data of sense; or of explaining, by means of nature and its evolutions, the spiritual elements in human experience, which connect man with the supernatural, the infinite, the divine—has suggested that those elements, presupposed by experience, must have been innate, or born with the mind; thus potentially belonging to it, antecedently to all required knowledge. This hypothesis has found expression in many forms; and it has waxed and waned, as the spiritual or the sensuous was most developed in the consciousness of the philosopher or of the age. Locke assails it in its crudest form, in which it is countenanced by no eminent advocate; according to which the ideas and principles which ultimately constitute knowledge are supposed to be held consciously, from birth, or even before it, in every human mind, being thus ‘stamped’ on us from the beginning, and ‘brought into the world’ with us. It is easy to refute this; for it can be shown that there are no principles of which all men are aware as soon as they are born, or even in which all mankind are agreed when they are adult. That data of experience are needed, to awaken what must otherwise be the slumbering potentialities of man’s spiritual being; and that human knowledge is the issue of sense when sense is combined with latent intellect, is an interpretation of the ‘established opinion,’ which Locke does not fairly contemplate.

3 Locke recognises the innateness of ‘faculties’ in calling them ‘natural’; but without examining whether any, and if so what, ideas and judgments are (consciously or unconsciously) presupposed in a rational exercise of the innate faculties.

4 ‘Originally imprinted’ and which therefore, he concludes, must have been present consciously from the first, before our faculties were exercised in experience.

5 This dogma of the conscious innateness of certain principles, or ‘maxims,’ is represented as the ‘common road’; departure from which seems to Locke to give his Essay that air of ‘novelty’ to which he so often refers.

6 ‘Constant impressions;’ I. e. of which there is a conscious impression in all human beings from birth, and about which all, even infants and idiots, are agreed.
3. This argument, drawn from universal consent, has this misfortune in it, that if it were true in matter of fact, that there were certain truths wherein all mankind agreed, it would not prove them innate, if there can be any other way shown how men may come to that universal agreement, in the things they do consent in, which I presume may be done7.

4. But, which is worse, this argument of universal consent, which is made use of to prove innate principles, seems to me a demonstration that there are none such: because there are none to which all mankind give an universal assent. I shall begin with the speculative, and instance in those magnified principles of demonstration, ‘Whatsoever is, is,’ and ‘It is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be’; which, of all others, I think have the most allowed title to innate8. These have so settled a reputation of maxims universally received, that it will no doubt be thought strange if any one should seem to question it. But yet I take liberty to say, that these propositions are so far from having an universal assent, that they are a great part of mankind to whom they are not so much as known.

5. For, first, it is evident, that all children and idiots have not the least apprehension or thought of them. And the want of that is enough to destroy that universal assent9 which must needs be the necessary concomitant of all innate truths: it seeming to me near a contradiction to say, that there are truths imprinted on the soul, which it perceives or understands not: imprinted, if it signify anything, being nothing else but the making certain truths to be perceived. For to imprint anything on the mind without the mind’s perceiving it, seems to me hardly intelligible. If therefore children and idiots have souls, have minds, with those impressions upon them, they must unavoidable perceive them, and necessarily know and assent to these truths; which since they do not, it is evident that there are no such impressions. For if they are not notions naturally imprinted, how can they be innate? and if they are notions imprinted, how can they be unknown? To say a notion is imprinted on the mind, and yet at the same time to say, that the mind is ignorant of it, and never yet took notice of it, is to make this impression nothing. No proposition can be said to be in the mind which it never yet knew, which it was never yet conscious of10. For if any one may, then, by the same reason, all propositions that are true, and the mind is capable ever of assenting to, may be said to be in the mind, and to be imprinted: since, if any one can be said to be in the mind, which it never yet knew, it must be only because it is capable of knowing it; and so the mind is of all truths it ever shall know. Nay, thus truths may be imprinted on the mind which it never did, nor ever shall know; for a man may live long and die at last in ignorance of many truths which his mind was capable of knowing11, and that with certainty. So that if the capacity of knowing be the natural impression contended for, all the truths a man ever comes to know will, by this account, be every one of them innate; and this great point will amount to no more, but only to a very improper way of speaking; which, whilst it pretends to assert the contrary, says nothing different from those who deny innate principles. For nobody, I think, ever denied that the mind was capable of knowing several truths. The capacity, they say, is innate; the knowledge acquired. But then to what end such contest for certain innate maxims? If truths can be imprinted on the understanding without being perceived, I can see no difference there can be between any truths the mind is capable in respect of their original: they must all be innate or all adventitious: in vain shall a man go about to distinguish them12. He therefore that talks of innate notions in the understanding, cannot (if he intend thereby any distinct sort of truths) mean such

---

7 Conscious consent on the part of every human being cannot be alleged on behalf of any abstract principle, as Locke is easily able to show. There is no proposition which some one has not been found to deny. A better criterion of the supernatural or divine, in man and in the universe, than this of ‘universal consent,’ which Locke makes so much of, is found, when it is shown,—that the full and adequate exercise of our faculties in experience necessarily presupposes principles of which the mass of mankind may be only dimly conscious, or wholly unconscious. Locke ignores the main issue; and when he explains his meaning is found nearer than he supposes to those who hold the imatness of reason in experience. He acknowledges innateness of faculty. Also that knowledge involves and is based upon what is self-evident is a prominent lesson of the Fourth Book. ‘That there can be any knowledge without self-evident propositions,’ he assures Stillingfleet that he is so far from denying, ‘that I am accused by your lordship for requiring more such in demonstration than you think necessary’ (Third Letter, p. 264). ‘I contend for the usefulness and necessity of self-evident propositions in all certainty, whether of intuition or demonstration’ (p. 286). ‘I make self-evident propositions necessary to certainty, and found all knowledge or certainty in them’ (p. 340).

8 These two, called by logicians the principles of identity and of contradiction, are again treated of in Bk. IV. ch. vii, where his distinction between consciousness of them at birth, which he denies, and the gradual discovery of their self-evidence, which he recognises, is illustrated. The second of the two is the axiom of axioms with Aristotle, itself indemonstrable because presupposed in all proof.

9 ‘Assent,’ i.e. actual or conscious, not potential or unconscious, although the whole question turns upon the latter. In Bk. IV. he confines ‘assent’ to judgments of probability exclusively thus contrasting it with ‘knowledge’ or absolute certainty.

10 The argument in this section assumes that ideas cannot be held mentally in a latent or unconscious state, that there cannot be impressions made on the mind without accompanying consciousness of them, a mental impression and a consciousness of it being regarded as identical. That there may be conditions, implied in the constitution of reason, to which our ideas, when they do emerge in consciousness, must conform, by necessity of reason, is a conception foreign to his view. Locke argues that no idea can be said to be ‘in the mind’ of which that mind is not neither actually peripient, or through memory capable of becoming peripient.

11 Locke never asks, as Kant afterwards did, what this ‘capacity,’ which he allows to be latent or innate, necessarily implies.

12 Not so: if the primitive necessities which constitute reason in us and in the universe can be distinguished by marks from the empirical generalisation of sense, and from generalised sense data. Not so; if there are ideas (concepts) which, by an intellectual necessity, on certain occasions in experience, form themselves in us, without our forming them by tentative generalisation. The question still remains—What does a capability of having experience imply?
truths to be in the understanding as it never perceived, and is yet wholly ignorant of. For if these words ‘to be in the understanding’ have any propriety, they signify to be understood. So that to be in the understanding, and not to be understood; to be in the mind and never to be perceived, is all one as to say anything is and is not in the mind or understanding. If therefore these two propositions, ‘Whatsoever is, is,’ and ‘It is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be,’ are by nature imprinted, children cannot be ignorant of them: infants, and all that have souls, must necessarily have them in their understandings, know the truth of them, and assent to it.13

6. To avoid this, it is usually answered, that all men know and assent to them, when they come to the use of reason14; and this is enough to prove them innate. I answer:

7. Doubtful expressions, that have scarce any signification, go for clear reasons to those who, being prepossessed, take not the pains to examine even what they themselves say. For, to apply this answer with any tolerable sense to our present purpose, it must signify one of these two things: either that as soon as men come to the use of reason these supposed native inscriptions come to be known and observed by them; or else, that the use and exercise of men’s reason, assists them in the discovery of these principles, and certainly makes them known to them.

8. If they mean, that by the use of reason men may discover these principles, and that this is sufficient to prove them innate; their way of arguing will and thus, viz. that whatever truths reason can certainly discover to us, and make us firmly assent to, those are all naturally imprinted on the mind; since that universal assent, which is made the mark of them, amounts to no more but this,—that by the use of reason we are capable to come to a certain knowledge15 of and assent to them: and, by this means, there will be no difference between the maxims of the mathematicians, and theorems they deduce from them: all must be equally allowed innate16; they begin all discoveries made by the use of reason, and truths that a rational creature may certainly come to know, if he apply his thought rightly that way.

9. But how can these men think the use of reason necessary to discover principles that are supposed innate, when reason deducing unknown truths from principles or propositions that are already known? That certainly can never be thought innate which we have need of reason to discover; unless, as I have said, we will have all the certain truths that reason ever teaches us, to be innate17. We may as well think the use of reason necessary to make our eyes discover visible objects, as that there should be need of reason, or the exercise thereof, to make the understanding see what is original engraven on it, and cannot be in the understanding before it be perceived by it. So that to make reason discover those truths thus imprinted, is to say, that the use of reason discovers to a man what he knew before: and if men have those innate impressed truths originally, and before the use of reason, and yet are always ignorant of them till they come to the use of reason, it is in effect to say, that men know and know them not at the same time18.

13 Universal consent may mean that any who do think such propositions intelligently must think them in one and the same way; not that every human being does in fact think them with conscious intelligence. In any other meaning universal consent could be no criterion of reason being innate or latent in us, and in the universe; for there are no propositions to which all human beings, including infants, give conscious consent.
14 Locke often uses ‘reason’ for reasoning; so here he means, when they come to the conscious use of the deductive faculty, which elicits previously known propositions from those already known.
15 ‘Knowledge’ and ‘assent,’ here used convertible, are in Bk. IV distinguished emphatically—self-evidence and demonstrable evidence constituting knowledge, while assent is determined by weighing probabilities.
16 As Leibniz held, who argued that all arithmetic and all geometry are virtually innate, and may (with effort) be found in the mind; as Plato showed when he made Socrates oblige a child to admit abstract truths without telling him anything. The innate knowledge of Plato and Leibniz is characterised, not by its independence of, and priority to, mental development in the individual, but by its intuited necessity and universality after it has been awakened into consciousness, in the exercise of intuitive and discursive reason.
17 Not so; if the criterion of innateness is sought, not in the process, but in the intellectual characteristics of the product.
18 The unconscious presence of principles which can be proved (by philosophical analysis) to be virtually presupposed in our certainties, and even in our assent to probability, is here overlooked.
15. The senses at first let in particular ideas, and furnish the yet empty cabinet\textsuperscript{19}, and the mind by degrees growing familiar with some of them, they are lodged in the memory, and names got to them. Afterwards, the mind proceeding further, abstracts them, and by degrees learns the use of general names\textsuperscript{20}. In this manner the mind comes to be furnished with ideas and language, the \textit{materials} about which to exercise its discursive faculty. And the use of reason becomes daily more visible, as these materials that give it employment increase\textsuperscript{21}. But though the having of general ideas and the use of general words and reason usually grow together, yet I see not how this any ways proves them innate. The knowledge of some truths, I confess, is very early in the mind; but in a way that shows them not to be innate. For, if we will observe, we shall find it still to be about ideas, not innate, but acquired; it being about those first which are imprinted by external things, with which infants have earliest to do, which make the most frequent impressions on their senses\textsuperscript{22}. In ideas thus got, the mind discovers that some agree and others differ, probably as soon as it has any use of memory; as soon as it is able to retain and perceive distinct ideas. But whether it be then or no, this is certain, it does so long before it has the use of words; or comes to that which we commonly call 'the use of reason.' For a child knows as certainly before it can speak that wormwood and sugarplums are not the same thing\textsuperscript{23}.

\textsuperscript{19} In this and the two following sentences Locke anticipates his own account, in the Second Book, of the origin and elaboration of ideas, which 'are all at first particular,' their generalisations being moreover only 'accidental.' The 'empty cabinet' represents the mind before its latent faculties have been quickened into exercise in experience. The 'sheet of blank paper' and 'waxed tablet' are misleading metaphors, which, after Aristotle and others, he elsewhere employs. In his endeavour to emphasise the difference between the continuous effort involved in the formation of human knowledge, and the perfect knowledge eternally present in the \textit{Supreme Mind},—thus enforcing his favourite lesson of an active private judgment in man,—he fails to see that to attribute to human knowledge innate elements, and also data of experience, is not contradictory, since all knowledge may involve both elements. But Locke might have unconsciously in view what his favourite Hooker thus expresses:—'In the matter of knowledge there is between the angels of God and the children of men this difference:—angels already have full and complete knowledge in the highest degree that can be imparted to them; men, if we view them in their spring, are at first without understanding or knowledge at all. Nevertheless, from this utter vacuity, \textit{they grow by degrees}, till they come at length to be even as the angels themselves are. That which agreeeth to the one \textit{now}, the other shall attain unto \textit{in the end}; they are not so far disjoined and severed but that they come at length to meet. The soul of \textit{man} being therefore \textit{at the first as a book wherein nothing is, and yet all things may be imprinted}, we are to search by what steps and degrees it is sifted into perfection of knowledge' (Eccles. Polit. Bk. I. § 6). Leibnitz takes the analogy of the marble to illustrate the latent presence in experience of ideas and principles which are influential without being recognised:—'Je me suis servi aussi de la comparaison d’une pierre de marbre qui a des veines plutôt que d’une pierre de marbre tout unie ou de tablettes vides, c’est-à-dire de ce qui s’appelle \textit{tabula rasa} chez les philosophes. Car si l’âme ressemblait à ces tablettes \textit{vides}, les vérités seraient en nous comme la figure d’Hercuel est dans un marbre \textit{quand le marbre est tout à fait indifférent à recevoir ou cette figure ou quelque autre}. Mais s’il y avait des veines dans la pierre qui marquaient la figure d’Hercuel préférablement à d’autres figures, cette pierre y serait plus déterminé, et Hercuel \textit{y serait comme inné en quelque façon}, quoiqu’il fallût du travail pour découvrir ces veines, et pour les nettoyer par la polissure, en retranchant ce qui les empêche de paraître. C’est ainsi que les idés et les vérités nous sont innés, comme des inclinations, des dispositions, des habitudes, ou des virtualités naturelles, et non pas comme des actions; quoique ces virtualités soient toujours accompagnés de quelques actions, souvent insensibles, qui y répondent.' (\textit{Nouveaux Essais}, Avant Propos.)

\textsuperscript{20} The process of human experience is here described as presenting three stages—perception or acquisition, retention, and elaboration of its material.

\textsuperscript{21} But the intellectual authority of a principle when evolved does not depend upon its natural genesis or evolution. That a judgment should arise in one’s consciousness \textit{under natural law} does not disprove its intrinsic necessity and universality, which reflective analysis may detect after it has thus arisen.

\textsuperscript{22} 'Les idées qui viennent des sens,' says Leibniz, 'sont confuses, et les vérités qui en dépendent le sont aussi, au moins en partie; au lieu que les idés intellectuelles, et les vérités qui en dépendent sont distinctes, et ni les unes ni les autres n’ont point leur origine des sens; quoiqu’il soit vrai que nous n’y penserions jamais sans les sens.' (\textit{Nouv. Ess.} I. i.)

\textsuperscript{23} That 'sweet is not bitter' involves recognition, in data of sense, of the abstract principle, that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be 'at the same time.' It is true that this concrete embodiment of it in a particular example is more evident to an uneducated mind than the highly abstract \textit{axiom} or \textit{axiom} which the embodiment logically presupposes, when its principle remains unexpressed in words or in consciousness, like an unexpressed premises in ordinary reasoning.
16. A child knows not that three and four are equal to seven, till he comes to be able to count seven, and has got the name and idea of equality; and then, upon explaining those words, he presently assents to, or rather perceives the truth of that proposition. But neither does he then readily assent because it is an innate truth, nor was his assent wanting till then because he wanted the use of reason; but the truth of it appears to him as soon as he has settled in his mind the clear and distinct ideas that these names stand for. And then he knows the truth of that proposition upon the same grounds and by the same means, that he knew before that a rod and a cherry are not the same thing; and upon the same grounds also that he may come to know afterwards “That it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be,” as shall be more fully shown hereafter. So that the later it is before any one comes to have those general ideas about which those maxims are; or to know the signification of those general terms that stand for them; or to put together in his mind the ideas they stand for; the later also will it be before he comes to assent to those maxims:—whose terms, with the ideas they stand for, being no more innate than those of a cat or a weasel, he must stay till time and observation have acquainted him with them; and then he will be in a capacity to know the truth of these maxims, upon the first occasion that shall make him put together those ideas in his mind, and observe whether they agree or disagree, according as is expressed in those propositions. And therefore it is that a man knows that eighteen and nineteen are equal to thirty-seven, by the same self-evidence that he knows one and two to be equal to three: yet a child knows this not so soon as the other; not for want of the use of reason, but because the ideas the words eighteen, nineteen, and thirty-seven stand for, are not so soon got, as those which are signified by one, two, and three.

Question:
1. What are the implication of Locke’s argument against innate ideas? Why was this notion considered dangerous?
18.2 David Hume: Of the Dignity or Meanness of Human Nature

David Hume (1711–1776) advocated a philosophy based on radical skepticism. For Hume, the things that most people took to be facts were simply a matter of customary belief. In the excerpt included here, Hume argued for the possibility of genuine human virtue.


There are certain sects, which secretly form themselves in the learned world, as well as factions in the political; and though sometimes they come not to an open rupture, they give a different turn to the ways of thinking of those who have taken part on either side. The most remarkable of this kind are the sects, founded on the different sentiments with regard to the dignity of human nature; which is a point that seems to have divided philosophers and poets, as well as divines, from the beginning of the world to this day. Some exalt our species to the skies, and represent man as a kind of human demigod, who derives his origin from heaven, and retains evident marks of his lineage and descent. Others insist upon the blind sides of human nature, and can discover nothing, except vanity, in which man surpasses the other animals, whom he affects so much to despise. If an author possess the talent of rhetoric and declamation, he commonly takes part with the former: If his turn lie towards irony and ridicule, he naturally throws himself into the other extreme.

I am far from thinking, that all those, who have depreciated our species, have been enemies to virtue, and have exposed the frailties of their fellow creatures with any bad intention. On the contrary, I am sensible that a delicate sense of morals, especially when attended with a splenetic* temper, is apt to give a man a disgust of the world, and to make him consider the common course of human affairs with too much indignation. I must, however, be of opinion, that the sentiments of those, who are inclined to think favourably of mankind, are more advantageous to virtue, than the contrary principles, which give us a mean opinion of our nature. When a man is prepossessed with a high notion of his rank and character in the creation, he will naturally endeavour to act up to it, and will scorn to do a base or vicious action, which might sink him below that figure which he makes in his own imagination. Accordingly we find, that all our polite and fashionable moralists insist upon this topic, and endeavour to represent vice as unworthy of man, as well as odious in itself.

We find few disputes, that are not founded on some ambiguity in the expression; and I am persuaded, that the present dispute, concerning the dignity or meanness of human nature, is not more exempt from it than any other. It may, therefore, be worth while to consider, what is real, and what is only verbal, in this controversy.

That there is a natural difference between merit and demerit, virtue and vice, wisdom and folly, no reasonable man will deny: Yet is it evident, that in affixing the term, which denotes either our approbation or blame, we are commonly more influenced by comparison than by any fixed unalterable standard in the nature of things. In like manner, quantity, and extension, and bulk, are by every one acknowledged to be real things: But when we call any animal great or little, we always form a secret comparison between that animal and others of the same species; and it is that comparison which regulates our judgment concerning its greatness. A dog and a horse may be of the very same size, while the one is admired for the greatness of its bulk, and the other for the smallness. When I am present, therefore, at any dispute, I always consider with myself, whether it be a question of comparison or not that is the subject of the controversy; and if it be, whether the disputants compare the same objects together, or talk of things that are widely different.

In forming our notions of human nature, we are apt to make a comparison between men and animals, the only creatures endowed with thought that fall under our senses. Certainly this comparison is favourable to mankind. On the one hand, we see a creature, whose thoughts are not limited by any narrow bounds, either of place or time; who carries his researches into the most distant regions of this globe, and beyond this globe, to the planets and heavenly bodies; looks backward to consider the first origin, at least, the history of human race; casts his eye forward to see the influence of his actions upon posterity, and the judgments which will be formed of his character a thousand years hence; a creature, who traces causes and effects to a great length and intricacy; extracts general principles from particular appearances; improves upon his discoveries; corrects his mistakes; and makes his very errors profitable. On the other hand, we are presented with a creature the very reverse of this; limited in its observations and reasonings to a few sensible objects which surround it; without curiosity, without foresight; blindly conducted by instinct, and attaining, in a short time, its utmost perfection, beyond which it is never able to advance a single step. What a wide difference is there between these creatures! And how exalted a notion must we entertain of the former, in comparison of the latter!
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There are two means commonly employed to destroy this conclusion: First, By making an unfair representation of the case, and insisting only upon the weaknesses of human nature. And secondly, By forming a new and secret comparison between man and beings of the most perfect wisdom. Among the other excellencies of man, this is one, that he can form an idea of perfections much beyond what he has experience of in himself; and is not limited in his conception of wisdom and virtue. He can easily exalt his notions and conceive a degree of knowledge, which, when compared to his own, will make the latter appear very contemptible, and will cause the difference between that and the sagacity of animals, in a manner, to disappear and vanish. Now this being a point, in which all the world is agreed, that human understanding falls infinitely short of perfect wisdom; it is proper we should know when this comparison takes place, that we may not dispute where there is no real difference in our sentiments. Man falls much more short of perfect wisdom, and even of his own ideas of perfect wisdom, than animals do of man; yet the latter difference is so considerable, that nothing but a comparison with the former can make it appear of little moment.

It is also usual to compare one man with another; and finding very few whom we can call wise or virtuous, we are apt to entertain a contemptible notion of our species in general. That we may be sensible of the fallacy of this way of reasoning, we may observe, that the honourable apppellations of wise and virtuous, are not annexed to any particular degree of those qualities of wisdom and virtue; but arise altogether from the comparison we make between one man and another. When we find a man, who arrives at such a pitch of wisdom as is very uncommon, we pronounce him a wise man: So that to say, there are few wise men in the world, is really to say nothing; since it is only by their scarcity, that they merit that appellation. Were the lowest of our species as wise as TULLY, or lord BACON,1 we should still have reason to say, that there are few wise men. For in that case we should exalt our notions of wisdom, and should not pay a singular honour to any one, who was not singularly distinguished by his talents. In like manner, I have heard it observed by thoughtless people, that there are few women possessed of beauty, in comparison of those who want it; not considering, that we bestow the epithet of beautiful only on such as possess a degree of beauty, that is common to them with a few. The same degree of beauty in a woman is called deformity, which is treated as real beauty in one of our sex.

As it is usual, in forming a notion of our species, to compare it with the other species above or below it, or to compare the individuals of the species among themselves; so we often compare together the different motives or actuating principles of human nature, in order to regulate our judgment concerning it. And, indeed, this is the only kind of comparison, which is worth our attention, or decides any thing in the present question. Were our selfish and vicious principles so much predominant above Our social and virtuous, as is asserted by some philosophers, we ought undoubtedly to entertain a contemptible notion of human nature.2

There is much of a dispute of words in all this controversy. When a man denies the sincerity of all public spirit or affection to a country and community, I am at a loss what to think of him. Perhaps he never felt this passion in so clear and distinct a manner as to remove all his doubts concerning its force and reality. But when he proceeds afterwards to reject all private friendship, if no interest or self-love intermix itself; I am then confident that he abuses terms, and confounds the ideas of things; since it is impossible for any one to be so selfish, or rather so stupid, as to make no difference between one man and another, and give no preference to qualities, which engage his approbation and esteem. Is he also, say I, as insensible to anger as he pretends to be to friendship? And does injury and wrong no more affect him than kindness or benevolence? May we not inquire, whether our sentiments of beauty and deformity, depend upon the different motives that engage them? And do we not attribute beauty and deformity to our friends, and deformity to our enemies? And is it not in this manner, that we are most sensible of the difference between the two species. For in that case we can scarce distinguish the one from the other.

Thus far I have only stated the matter, without giving my opinion. It is proper to observe, that there are few unselfish men in the world: And all mankind are apt to be partial, either to themselves or others. There is a common idea of beauty and deformity, which is formed to suit the habits of mind; and the idea of the latter is obtained from the idea of the former. This is the manner of making our notions of human nature.2

1 [Marcus Tullius Cicero is sometimes referred to in English literature as Tully. Francis Bacon, first Baron Verulam and Viscount St. Albans, held many official posts, including Lord Keeper and Lord Chancellor. Hume praises Bacon in the Introduction to the Treatise as the founder of the new “experimental method of reasoning” in the sciences.]
2 [See Hume’s Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals, especially Appendix II (“Of Self-Love”), where Hobbes and Locke are identified as modern proponents of “the selfish system of morality.”]
ion and good will; or not to shock your ears with these expressions, the self-love of every one, and mine among the rest, will then incline us to serve you, and speak well of you.

In my opinion, there are two things which have led astray those philosophers, that have insisted so much on the selfishness of man. In the first place, they found, that every act of virtue or friendship was attended with a secret pleasure; whence they concluded, that friendship and virtue could not be disinterested. But the fallacy of this is obvious. The virtuous sentiment or passion produces the pleasure, and does not arise from it. I feel a pleasure in doing good to my friend, because I love him; but do not love him for the sake of that pleasure.

In the second place, it has always been found, that the virtuous are far from being indifferent to praise; and therefore they have been represented as a set of vain-glorious men, who had nothing in view but the applauses of others. But this also is a fallacy. It is very unjust in the world, when they find any tincture of vanity in a laudable action, to depreciate it upon that account, or ascribe it entirely to that motive. The case is not the same with vanity, as with other passions. Where avarice or revenge enters into any seemingly virtuous action, it is difficult for us to determine how far it enters, and it is natural to suppose it the sole actuating principle. But vanity is so closely allied to virtue, and to love the fame of laudable actions approaches so near the love of laudable actions for their own sake, that these passions are more capable of mixture, than any other kinds of affection; and it is almost impossible to have the latter without some degree of the former. Accordingly, we find, that this passion for glory is always warped and varied according to the particular taste or disposition of the mind on which it falls. Nero had the same vanity in driving a chariot, that Trajan had in governing the empire with justice and ability.³ To love the glory of virtuous deeds is a sure proof of the love of virtue.

Question:

1. What does Hume think of the arguments over human nature?

³ [Nero was emperor of Rome from A.D. 54 to 68. Trajan was emperor from A.D. 98 to 117.]
18.3 Charles Montesquieu: Book 4 from The Spirit of the Laws

Charles Montesquieu (1689–1755) was the president of the parlement of Bordeaux and a leading political philosopher of his day. The influence of John Locke can be seen in much of his work. In The Spirit of the Laws, Montesquieu compared republican, monarchical, and despotic government.


BOOK 4
THAT THE LAWS OF EDUCATION SHOULD BE RELATIVE TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE GOVERNMENT

Chapter 1
On the laws of education

The laws of education are the first we receive. And as these prepare us to be citizens, each particular family should be governed according to the plan of the great family that includes them all.

If there is a principle for the people taken generally, then the parts which compose it, that is, the families, will have one also. Therefore, the laws of education will be different in each kind of government. In monarchies, their object will be honor; in republics, virtue; in despotisms, fear.

Chapter 2
On education in monarchies

In monarchies the principal education is not in the public institutions where children are instructed; in a way, education begins when one enters the world. The world is the school of what is called honor, the universal master that should everywhere guide us.

Here, one sees and always hears three things: that a certain nobility must be put in the virtues, a certain frankness in the mores, and a certain politeness in the manners.

The virtues we are shown here are always less what one owes others than what one owes oneself; they are not so much what calls us to our fellow citizens as what distinguishes us from them.

One judges men’s actions here not as good but as fine, not as just but as great; not as reasonable but as extraordinary.

As soon as honor can find something noble here, honor becomes either a judge who makes it legitimate or a sophist who justifies it. It allows gallantry when gallantry is united with the idea of an attachment of the heart or the idea of conquest; and this is the true reason mores are never as pure in monarchies as in republican governments.

It allows deceit when deceit is added to the idea of greatness of spirit or greatness of business, as in politics, whose niceties do not offend it.

It forbids adulation only when adulation is separated from the idea of a great fortune and is joined only with the feeling of one’s own meanness.

I have said that, in monarchies, education should bring a certain frankness to the mores. Therefore, truth is desired in speech. But is this for the love of truth? Not at all. It is desired because a man accustomed to speaking the truth appears to be daring and free. Indeed, such a man seems dependent only on things and not on the way another receives them.

This is why, commending this kind of frankness here, one scorns that of the people, which has for its aim only truth and simplicity.

Finally, education in monarchies requires a certain politeness in manners. Men, born to live together, are also born to please each other; and he who does not observe the proprieties offends all those with whom he lives and discredits himself so much that he becomes unable to do any good thing.

But politeness does not customarily have its origin in such a pure source. It arises from the desire to distinguish oneself. We are polite from arrogance; we flatter ourselves that our manners prove that we are not common and that we have not lived with the sort of people who have been neglected through the ages.

---

a Dès que l’honneur y peut trouver quelque chose de noble, il est ou le juge qui les [le] rend legitimes, ou le sophiste qui les [le] justifie.
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In monarchies, politeness is naturalized at court. One excessively great man makes all others small. Hence the regard owed to everyone else and the politeness that flatters as much those who are polite as those to whom they are polite, because that politeness makes it understood that one belongs to the court or that one is worthy of belonging to it.

The courtly air consists in putting away one's own greatness for a borrowed greatness. This greatness is more flattering to a courtier than is his own. It gives a certain haughty modesty that spreads afar but whose arrogance diminishes imperceptibly in proportion to its distance from the source of greatness.

At court one finds a delicacy of taste in all things, which comes from continual use of the excesses of a great fortune, from the variety, and especially the weariness, of pleasures, from the multiplicity, even the confusion, of fancies, which, when they are pleasing, are always accepted.

Education bears on all these things to make what is called the honnête homme, who has all the qualities and all the virtues required in his government.

Honor, meddling in everything, enters into all the modes of thought and all the ways of feeling and even directs the principles.

This eccentric honor shapes the virtues into what it wants and as it wants: on its own, it puts rules on everything prescribed to us; according to its fancy, it extends or limits our duties, whether their source be religion, politics, or morality.

There is nothing in monarchy that laws, religion, and honor prescribe so much as obedience to the wills of the prince, but this honor dictates to us that the prince should never prescribe an action that dishonors us because it would make us incapable of serving him.

Crillon refused to assassinate the Duke of Guise, but he proposed to Henry III that he engage the duke in battle. After Saint Bartholomew's Day, when Charles IX had sent orders to all the governors to have the Huguenots massacred, the Viscount of Orte, who was in command at Bayonne, wrote to the king, “Sire, I have found among the inhabitants and the warriors only good citizens, brave soldiers, and not one executioner; thus, they and I together beg Your Majesty to use our arms and our lives for things that can be done.” This great and generous courage regarded a cowardly action as an impossible thing.

For the nobility, honor prescribes nothing more than serving the prince in war: indeed, this is the preeminent profession because its risks, successes, and even misfortunes lead to greatness. But honor wants to be the arbiter in imposing this law; and if honor has been offended, it permits or requires one to withdraw to one's home.

It wants one to be able indifferently to aspire to posts or to refuse them; it regards this liberty as greater than fortune itself.

Honor, therefore, has its supreme rules, and education is obliged to conform to them. The principal rules are that we are indeed allowed to give importance to our fortune but that we are sovereignty forbidden to give any to our life.

The second is that, when we have once been placed in a rank, we should do or suffer nothing that might show that we consider ourselves interior to the rank itself.

The third is that, what honor forbids is more rigorously forbidden when the laws do not agree in proscribing it, and that what honor requires is more strongly required when the laws do not require it.

Chapter 3
On education in despotic government

Just as education in monarchies works only to elevate the heart, education in despotic states seeks only to bring it down. There, education must bring about servility. It will be a good, even for the commander, to have had such an education, since no one is a tyrant there without at the same time being a slave.

Extreme obedience assumes ignorance in the one who obeys; it assumes ignorance even in the one who commands; he does not have to deliberate, to doubt, or to reason; he has only to want.

In despotic states, each household is a separate empire. Therefore, education, which comes mainly from living with others, is quite limited there; it is reduced to putting fear in the heart and in teaching the spirit a few very simple religious principles. Knowledge will be dangerous, rivalry deadly; and, as for the virtues, Aristotle cannot believe that any are proper to slaves; this would indeed limit education in this government.

---

*b In the seventeenth century honnête homme came to refer to a gentleman of courtly manner who was not necessarily noble by birth.
1 See [Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné's Histoire universale [bk. 6, chap. 5; 3.364; 1985 edn.]].
2 These comments refer to what is and not to what should be; honor is a prejudice, which religion sometimes works to destroy and sometimes to regulate.
3 [Aristotle] Pol., bk. I [1260a34–1260b8].
Therefore, education is, in a way, null there. One must take everything away in order to give something and begin by making a bad subject in order to make a good slave.

Well! Why would education be intent upon forming a good citizen to take part in the public unhappiness? If he loved the state, he would be tempted to relax the springs of the government; if he failed, he would be ruined; if he succeeded, he would run the risk of ruining himself, the prince, and the empire.

Chapter 4
The difference in the effect of education among the ancients and among ourselves

Most of the ancient peoples lived in governments that had virtue for their principle, and when that virtue was in full force, things were done in those governments that we no longer see and that astonish our small souls.

Their education had another advantage over ours; it was never contradicted. In the last year of his life, Epaminondas said, heard, saw, and did the same things as at the time that he was first instructed.

Today we receive three different or opposing educations: that of our fathers, that of our schoolmasters, and that of the world. What we are told by the last upsets all the ideas of the first two. This comes partly from the opposition there is for us between the ties of religion and those of the world, a thing unknown among the ancients.

Chapter 5
On education in republican government

It is in republican government that the full power of education is needed. Fear in despotic governments arises of itself from threats and chastisements; honor in monarchies is favored by the passions and favors them in turn; but political virtue is a renunciation of oneself, which is always a very painful thing.

One can define this virtue as love of the laws and the homeland. This love, requiring a continuous preference of the public interest over one’s own, produces all the individual virtues; they are only that preference.

This love is singularly connected with democracies. In them alone, government is entrusted to each citizen. Now government is like all things in the world; in order to preserve it, one must love it.

One never hears it said that kings do not love monarchy or that despots hate despotism.

Therefore, in a republic, everything depends on establishing this love, and education should attend to inspiring it.

But there is a sure way for children to have it; it is for the fathers themselves to have it.

One is ordinarily in charge of giving one’s knowledge to one’s children and even more in charge of giving them one’s own passions.

If this does not happen, it is because what was done in the father’s house is destroyed by impressions from the outside.

It is not young people who degenerate; they are ruined only when grown men have already been corrupted.

Question:
1. Why is education most complete and important in a Republic?
18.4 The *Encyclopédie*

The work of a group of French philosophes, chief among them Denis Diderot (1713–1784) and Jean le Rond d’Alembert (1717–1783), the *Encyclopédie* (1751) brought together the various strands of the Enlightenment world view. Printed without official government license, the work touched on all aspects of eighteenth-century life. The excerpt included here is from the *Encyclopédie’s* famous preliminary discourse.


It cannot be denied that, since the revival of letters among us, we owe partly to dictionaries the general enlightenment that has spread in society and the germ of science that is gradually preparing men’s minds for more profound knowledge. How valuable would it not be, then, to have a book of this kind that one could consult on all subjects and that would serve as much to guide those who have the courage to work at the instruction of others as to enlighten those who only instruct themselves!

This is one advantage we thought of, but it is not the only one. In condensing to dictionary form all that concerns the arts and sciences, it remained necessary to make people aware of the assistance they lend each other; to make use of this assistance to render principles more certain and their consequences clearer; to indicate the distant and close relationships of the beings that make up nature, which have occupied men; to show, by showing the interlacing both of roots and of branches, the impossibility of understanding thoroughly some parts of the whole without exploring many others; to produce a general picture of the efforts of the human spirit in all areas and in all centuries; to present these matters with clarity; to give to each the proper scope, and to prove, if possible, our epigraph by our success.

The majority of these works appeared during the last century and were not completely scorned. It was found that if they did not show much talent, they at least bore the marks of labor and of knowledge. But what would these encyclopedias mean to us? What progress have we not made since then in the arts and sciences? How many truths discovered today, which were not foreseen then? True philosophy was in its cradle; the geometry of infinity did not yet exist; experimental physics was just appearing; the laws of sound criticism were entirely unknown. Descartes, Boyle, Huyghens, Newton, Leibnitz, the Bernoullis, Locke, Bayle, Pascal, Corneille, Racine, Bourdaloue, Bossuet, etc., either had not yet been born or had not yet written. The spirit of research and competition did not motivate the scholars: another spirit, less fecund perhaps, but rarer, that of precision and method, had not yet conquered the various divisions of literature; and the academies, whose efforts have advanced the arts and sciences to such an extent, were not yet established. . . . At the end of this project you will find the tree of human knowledge, indicating the connection of ideas, which has directed us in this vast operation.

Questions:
1. What do these thinkers see as Enlightenment? What makes it possible? What hinders it?
2. What do they criticize?
3. How do they want to change the world? Consider ideas, institutions, values, and behaviors.
4. What do Enlightenment thinkers perceive to be their relationship to the past?
5. Do they want or envision revolution? Explain why or why not.
18.5 A Doctor Criticizes Midwives

The drive to bring Enlightenment principles to eighteenth-century medicine carried with it an implicit attack on traditional medical practitioners, particularly uneducated women. It should be noted that “enlightened” educated male physicians were often no more successful at treating patients than their uneducated counterparts and, especially in the case of childbirth, sometimes notably less successful.


The need for enlightened midwives in most of the country and I dare say in all of Europe is a well-known misfortune, which has the most disastrous consequences and which demands the full attention of the government.

The errors they commit during deliveries are infinite and too often irremedial. We need a book expressly to give precise directions to alert them and we need to educate midwives fit to understand them. I will mention only one of their practices which does the most harm: it is the use of warm remedies which they give when the delivery is particularly painful or slow—such things as castor oil, safran, sage, rue, oil of ambergris, wine, theriaque, wine prepared with aromatics, coffee, liqueur of anis, nuts, or fennel and all other liqueurs. All these things are true poisons, which, far from speeding up the delivery in fact make it more difficult by inflaming both the uterus, which can then no longer contract, and all the parts, which serve as a passage and which as a result swell and then make the way narrower. At other times these warm poisons produce hemorrhages which can kill the mother in a short time.

One saves both mothers and infants by the opposite treatment. As soon as a healthy women finds herself in labor and if that labor appears excessively painful and difficult, far from encourageing premature efforts by the remedies I just mentioned, which will end everything, one should order the mother to be bled in the arm which will prevent inflammation, which will stop the pain, and which will relax the body and make it more favorably disposed. One should give no food during labor except a little bread soup every three hours and water thickened with flour. Every four hours one should cleanse the passage with a mixture of mallow and oil... rub it with a little butter and place compresses of hot water on the abdomen.

Questions:
1. What justification do these authors give for wanting to change conditions from the status quo?
2. How are science and Enlightenment principles applied to peoples’ everyday lives?
3. Do you agree with these applications? Why or why not?
4. Do the changes have any value today? Why or why not?
18.6 Medicine from Turkey: The Small Pox Vaccination

Given the document above, it is ironic that one of the most important eighteenth-century medical innovations, the small pox vaccination, was brought to Europe from Turkey, a place where, by the author’s own admission, the administration of the vaccine was the province of a “set of old women.” Despite the fact that small pox killed countless Europeans every year, it took many decades for the vaccine to achieve widespread use and acceptance in the West.


To [Sarah Chiswell] I April [1717]


I am sure there is on my side a very good Excuse for Silence, having gone such tiresome Land Journeys, tho’ I don’t find the conclusion of ‘em so bad as you seem to imagine. I am very easy here and not in the Solitude you fancy me; the great Quantity of Greek, French, English and Italians that are under our Protection make their court to me from Morning till Night, and I’ll assure you are many of ‘em very fine Ladys, for there is no possibility for a Christian to live easily under this Government but by the protection of an Ambassador, and the richer they are the greater their Danger.

Those dreadful Storys you have heard of the plague have very little foundation in Truth. I own I have much ado to reconcile my selfe to the Sound of a Word which has allways given me such terrible Ideas, tho’ I am convinc’d there is little more in it than a fever, as a prooffe of which we past through 2 or 3 Towns most violently infected. In the very next house where we lay, in one of ‘em, 2 persons dy’d of it. Luckily for me I was so well deceiv’d that I knew nothing of the matter, and I was made beleive that our 2nd Cook who fell ill there had only a great cold. However, we left our Doctor to take care of him, and yesterday they both arriv’d here in good Health and I am now let into the Secret that he has had the Plague.¹ There are many that ‘scape of it, neither is the air ever infected. I am perswaded it would be as easy to root it out here as out of Italy and France, but it does so little mischeife, they are not very solicitous about it and are content to suffer this distemper instead of our Variety, which they are utterly unacquainted with.

A propos of Distempers, I am going to tell you a thing that I am sure will make you wish your selfe here. The Small Pox so fatal and so general amongst us² is here entirely harmless by the invention of engrafting (which is the term they give it). There is a set of old Women who make it their business to perform the Operation. Every Autumn in the month of September, when the great Heat is abated, people send to one another to know if any of their family has a mind to have the small pox. They make partys for this purpose, and when they are met (commonly 15 or 16 together) the old Woman comes with a nutshell full of the matter of the best sort of small-pox and asks what veins you please to have open’d. She immediately rips open that you offer to her with a large needle (which gives you no more pain than a common scratch) and puts into the vein as much venom as can lye upon the head of her needle, and after binds up the little wound with a hollow bit of shell, and in this manner opens 4 or 5 veins. The Grecians have commonly the superstition of opening one in the Middle of the forehead, in each arm and on the breast to mark the sign of the cross, but this has a very ill effect, all these wounds leaving little Scars, and is not done by those that are not superstitious, who chuse to have them in the legs or that part of the arm that is conceal’d. The children or young patients play together all the rest of the day and are in perfect health till the 8th. Then the fever begins to seize ‘em, and they keep their beds 2 days, very seldom 3. They have very rarely above 20 or 30 in their faces, which never marks, and in 8 days time they are as well as before their illness. Where they are wounded there remains running sores during the Distemper, which I don’t doubt is a great releife to it. Every year thousands undergo this Operation, and the French Ambassador says pleasantly that they take the Small pox here by way of diversion as they take the Waters in other Countrys. There is no example of any one that has dy’d in it, and you may beleive I am very well satisfy’d of the safety of the Experiment since I intend to try it on my dear little Son. I am Patriot enough to take pains to bring this usefull invention into fashion in England, and I should not fail to write to some of our

¹ In his dispatch of 10 April 1717 [31 March O.S.] W wrote that when he set out from Belgrade ‘notwithstanding I was inform’d there was nothing of the Plague in the road, it was in my family before I got to Nissa’ (SP 97/24).
² In Dec. 1715 LM had been stricken with smallpox, but unexpectedly recovered (Halsband, LM, pp. 51–52).
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Doctors very particularly about it if I knew any one of ‘em that I thought had Virtue enough of destroy such a considerable branch of their Revenue for the good of Mankind, but that Distemper is too beneficial to them nor to expose to all their Resentment the hardy wight that should undertake to put an end to it. Perhaps if I live to return I may, however, have courage to war with ‘em.

To Wortley 23 March [1718]

March 23, Sunday

. . . . . .

The boy was engrafted last Tuesday, and is at this time singing and playing and very impatient for his summer. I pray God my next may give as good an Account of him.

. . . . . .

I cannot graft the Girl; her Nurse has not had the small Pox.

To Wortley 1 April [1718]

Your Son is as well as can be expected, and I hope past all manner of danger. . . .

Questions:
1. What justification do these authors give for wanting to change conditions from the status quo?
2. How are science and Enlightenment principles applied to peoples’ everyday lives?
3. Do you agree with these applications? Why or why not?
4. Do the changes have any value today? Why or why not?
Adam Smith’s *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) is still one of the most well-known and influential works on classical liberal economics. In the following excerpts, Smith makes the case for the benefits and costs of division of labor in manufacturing, the art of war and defense, and education.


To take an example, therefore, from a very trifling manufacture; but one in which the division of labour has been very often taken notice of, the trade of the pin-maker; a workman not educated to this business (which the division of labour has rendered a distinct trade), not acquainted with the use of the machinery employed in it (to the invention of which the same division of labour has probably given occasion), could scarce, perhaps, with his utmost industry, make one pin in a day, and certainly could not make twenty. But in the way in which this business is now carried on, not only the whole work is a peculiar trade, but it is divided into a number of branches, of which the greater part are likewise peculiar trades. One man draws out the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth grinds it at the top for receiving the head; to make the head requires two or three distinct operations; to put it on, is a peculiar business, to whiten the pins is another; it is even a trade by itself to put them into the paper; and the important business of making a pin is, in this manner, divided into about eighteen distinct operations, which, in some manufactories, are all performed by distinct hands, though in others the same man will sometimes perform two or three of them. I have seen a small manufactory of this kind where ten men only were employed, and where some of them consequently performed two or three distinct operations. But though they were very poor, and therefore but indifferently accommodated with the necessary machinery, they could, when they exerted themselves, make among them about twelve pounds of pins in a day. There are in a pound upwards of four thousand pins of a middling size. Those ten persons, therefore, could make among them upwards of forty-eight thousand pins in a day. Each person, therefore, making a tenth part of forty-eight thousand pins, might be considered as making four thousand eight hundred pins in a day. But if they had all wrought separately and independently, and without any of them having been educated to this peculiar business, they certainly could not each of them have made twenty, perhaps not one pin in a day; that is, certainly, not the two hundred and fortieth, perhaps not the four thousand eight hundredth part of what they are at present capable of performing, in consequence of a proper division and combination of their different operations.

In every other art and manufacture, the effects of the division of labour are similar to what they are in this very trifling one; though, in many of them, the labour can neither be so much subdivided, nor reduced to so great a simplicity of operation. The division of labour, however, so far as it can be introduced, occasions, in every art, a proportionable increase of the productive powers of labour. The separation of different trades and employments from one another, seems to have taken place, in consequence of this advantage. This separation too is generally carried furthest in those countries which enjoy the highest degree of industry and improvement; what is the work of one man in a rude state of society, being generally that of several in an improved one. In every improved society, the farmer is generally nothing but a farmer; the manufacturer, nothing but a manufacturer. The labour too which is necessary to produce any one complete manufacturer, is almost always divided among a great number of hands. How many different trades are employed in each branch of the linen and woollen manufactures, from the growers of the flax and the wool, to the bleachers and smoothers of the linen, or to the dyers and dressers of the cloth!

This great increase of the quantity of work which, in consequence of the division of labour, the same number of people are capable of performing, is owing to three different circumstances;

First, the improvement of the dexterity of the workman necessarily increases the quantity of the work he can perform; and the division of labour, by reducing every man’s business to some one simple operation, and by making this operation the sole employment of his life, necessarily increases very much the dexterity of the workman.

Secondly, the advantage which is gained by saving the time commonly lost in passing from one sort of work to another, is much greater than we should at first view be apt to imagine it. It is impossible to pass very quickly from one kind of work to another; that is carried on in a different place, and with quite different tools.
A man commonly saunters a little in turning his hand from one sort of employment to another. When he first begins the new work he is seldom very keen and hearty; his mind, as they say, does not go to it, and for some time he rather trifles than applies to good purpose. The habit of sauntering and of indolent careless application, which is naturally, or rather necessarily acquired by every country workman who is obliged to change his work and his tools every half hour, and to apply his hand in twenty different ways almost every day of his life; renders him almost always slothful and lazy, and incapable of any vigorous application even on the most pressing occasions.

It is the great multiplication of the productions of all the different arts, in consequence of the division of labour, which occasions, in a well-governed society, that universal opulence which extends itself to the lowest ranks of the people. Every workman has a great quantity of his own work to dispose of beyond what he himself has occasion for; and every other workman being exactly in the same situation, he is enabled to exchange a great quantity of his own goods for a great quantity, or, what comes to the same thing, for the price of a great quantity of theirs. He supplies them abundantly with what they have occasion for, and a general plenty diffuses itself through all the different ranks of the society. 

Observe the accommodation of the most common artificer or day-labourer in a civilized and thriving country, and you will perceive that the number of people of whose industry a part, though but a small part, has been employed in procuring him this accommodation, exceeds all computation. The woollen coat, for example, which covers the day-labourer, as coarse and rough as it may appear, is the produce of the joint labour of a great multitude of workmen. The shepherd, the sorter of the wool, the wool-comber or carder, the dyer, the scribbler, the spinner, the weaver, the fuller, the dresser, with many others, must all join their different arts in order to complete even this homely production. How many merchants and carriers, besides, must have been employed in transporting the materials from some of those workmen to others who often live in a very distant part of the country! how much commerce and navigation in particular, how many ship-builders, sailors, sail-makers, rope-makers, must have been employed in order to bring together the different drugs made use of by the dyer, which often come from the remotest corners of the world!

The number of those who can go to war, in proportion to the whole number of the people, is necessarily much smaller in a civilized, than in a rude state of society.

In the little agrarian states of ancient Greece, a fourth or a fifth part of the whole body of the people considered themselves as soldiers, and would sometimes, it is said, take the field. Among the civilized nations of modern Europe, it is commonly computed, that not more than one hundredth part of the inhabitants of any country can be employed as soldiers, without ruin to the country which pays the expence of their service.

In the republics of ancient Greece and Rome, during the whole period of their existence, and under the feudal governments for a considerable time after their first establishment, the trade of a soldier was not a separate, distant trade, which constituted the sole or principal occupation of a particular class of citizens. Every subject of the state, whatever might be the ordinary trade or occupation by which he gained his livelihood, considered himself, upon all ordinary occasions, as fit likewise to exercise the trade of a soldier, and upon many extraordinary occasions as bound to exercise it.

The art of war, however, as it is certainly the noblest of all arts, so in the progress of improvement it necessarily becomes one of the most complicated among them. The state of the mechanical, as well as of some other arts, with which it is necessarily connected, determines the degree of perfection to which it is capable of being carried at any particular time. But in order to carry it to this degree of perfection, it is necessary that it should become the sole or principal occupation of a particular class of citizens, and the division of labour is as necessary for the improvement of this, as of every other art. Into other arts the division of labour is naturally introduced by the prudence of individuals, who find that they promote their private interest better by confining themselves to a particular trade, than by exercising a great number. But it is the wisdom of the state only which can render the trade of a soldier a particular trade separate and distinct from all others. A private citizen who, in time of profound peace, and without any particular encouragement from the public, should spend the greater part of his time in military exercises, might, no doubt, both improve himself very much in them, and amuse himself very well; but he certainly would not promote his own interest. It is the wisdom of the state only which can render it
for his interest to give up the greater part of his time to this peculiar occupation: and states have not always had this wisdom, even when their circumstances had become such, that the preservation of their existence required that they should have it.

A shepherd has a great deal of leisure; a husband-man, in the rude state of husbandry, has some; an artificer or manufacturer has none at all. The first may, without any loss, employ a great deal of his time in martial exercises; the second may employ some part of it; but the last cannot employ a single hour in them without some loss, and his attention to his own interest naturally leads him to neglect them altogether.

Military exercises come to be as much neglected by the inhabitants of the country as by those of the town, and the great body of the people becomes altogether unwarlike. That wealth, at the same time, which always follows the improvements of agriculture and manufacturers, and which in reality is no more than the accumulate produce of those improvements, provokes the invasion of all their neighbours. An industrious, and upon that account a wealthy nation, is of all nations the most likely to be attacked; and unless the state takes some new measures for the public defence, the natural habits of the people render them altogether incapable of defending themselves.

In these circumstances, there seem to be but two methods, by which the state can make any tolerable provision for the public defence. It may either, first, by means of a very rigorous police, and in spite of the whole bent of the interest, genius and inclinations of the people, enforce the practice of military exercises, and oblige either all the citizens of the military age, or a certain number of them, to join in some measure the trade of a soldier to whatever other trade of profession they may happen to carry on. [a militia]

Or, secondly, by maintaining and employing a certain number of citizens in the constant practice of military exercises, it may render the trade of a soldier a particular trade, separate and distinct from all others. [a standing army]

In a militia, the character of the labourer, artificer, or tradesman, predominates over that of the soldier: in a standing army, that of the soldier predominates over every other character; and in this distinction seems to consist the essential difference between those two different species of military force.

Regularity, order, and prompt obedience to command, are qualities which, in modern armies, are of more importance towards determining the fate of battles, than the dexterity and skill of the soldiers in the use of their arms. But the noise of the fire-arms, the smoke, and the invisible death to which every man feels himself every moment exposed, as soon as he comes within cannon-shot, and frequently a long time before the battle can be well said to be engaged, must render it very difficult to maintain any considerable degree of this regularity, order, and prompt obedience, even in the beginning of a modern battle.

But the habits of regularity, order, and prompt obedience to command, can be acquired only by troops which are exercised in great bodies.

A militia, however, in whatever manner it may be either disciplined or exercised, must always be much inferior to a well-disciplined and well-exercised standing army.

The soldiers, who are exercised only once a week, or once a month, can never be so expert in the use of their arms, as those who are exercised every day, or every other day; and though this circumstance may not be of so much consequence in modern, as it was in ancient times, yet the acknowledged superiority of the Prussian troops, owing, it is said, very much to their superior expertness in their exercise, may satisfy us that it is, even at this day, of very considerable consequence.

The soldiers, who are bound to obey their officer only once a week or once a month, and who are at all other times at liberty to manage their own affairs their own way, without being in any respect accountable to him, can never be under the same awe in his presence, can never have the same disposition to ready obedience, with those whose whole life and conduct are every day directed by him, and who every day even rise and go to bed, or at least retire to their quarters, according to his orders. In what is called discipline, or in the habit of ready obedience, a militia must always be still more inferior to a standing army, than it may sometimes be in what is called the manual exercise, or in the management and use of its arms. But in modern war the habit of ready and instant obedience is of much greater consequence than a considerable superiority in the management of arms.
Before the invention of fire-arms, that army was superior in which the soldiers had, each individually, the greatest skill and dexterity in the use of their arms. Strength and agility of body were of the highest consequence, and commonly determined the fate of battles. But this skill and dexterity in the use of their arms, could be acquired only, in the same manner as fencing is at present, by practising, not in great bodies, but each man separately, in a particular school, under a particular master, or with his own particular equals and companions. Since the invention of fire-arms, strength and agility of body, or even extraordinary dexterity and skill in the use of arms, though they are far from being of no consequence, are, however, of less consequence. The nature of the weapon, though it by no means puts the awkward upon a level with the skilful, puts him more nearly so than he ever was before. All the dexterity and skill, it is supposed, which are necessary for using it, can be well enough acquired by practising in great bodies.

[On Education]
In the progress of the division of labour, the employment of the far greater part of those who live by labour, that is, of the great body of the people, comes to be confined to a few very simple operations; frequently to one or two. But the understandings of the greater part of men are necessarily formed by their ordinary employments. The man whose whole life is spent in performing a few simple operations, of which the effects too are, perhaps, always the same, or very nearly the same, has no occasion to exert his understanding, or to exercise his invention in finding out expedients for removing difficulties which never occur. He naturally loses, therefore, the habit of such exertion, and generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become. The torpor of his mind renders him, not only incapable of relishing or bearing a part in any rational conversation, but of conceiving any generous, noble, or tender sentiment, and consequently of forming any just judgment concerning many even of the ordinary duties of private life. Of the great and extensive interests of his country he is altogether incapable of judging; and unless very particular pains have been taken to render him otherwise, he is equally incapable of defending his country in war. The uniformity of his stationary life naturally corrupts the courage of his mind, and makes him regard with abhorrence the irregular, uncertain, and adventurous life of a soldier. It corrupts even the activity of his body, and renders him incapable of exerting his strength with vigour and perseverance, in any other employment than that to which he has been bred. His dexterity at his own particular trade seems, in this manner, to be acquired at the expense of his intellectual, social, and martial virtues. But in every improved and civilized society this is the state into which the labouring poor, that is, the great body of the people, must necessarily fall, unless government takes some pains to prevent it.

It is otherwise in the barbarous societies, as they are commonly called, of hunters, of shepherds, and even of husbandmen in that rude state of husbandry which precedes the improvement of manufacturers, and the extension of foreign commerce. In such societies the varied occupations of every man oblige every man to exert his capacity, and to invent expedients for removing difficulties which are continually occurring. Invention is kept alive, and the mind is not suffered to fall into that drowsy stupidity, which, in a civilized society, seems to benumb the understanding of almost all the inferior ranks of people. In those barbarous societies, as they are called, every man, it has already been observed, is a warrior. Every man too is in some measure a statesman, and can form a tolerable judgment concerning the interest of the society, and the conduct of those who govern it.

The education of the common people requires, perhaps, in a civilized and commercial society, the attention of the public more than that of people of some rank and fortune. People of some rank and fortune are generally eighteen or nineteen years of age before they enter upon that particular business, profession, or trade, by which they propose to distinguish themselves in the world. They have before that full time to acquire, or at least to fit themselves for afterwards acquiring, every accomplishment which can recommend them to the public esteem, or render them worthy of it. Their parents or guardians are generally sufficiently anxious that they should be so accomplished, and are, in most cases, willing enough to lay out the expense which is necessary for that purpose.

The employments too in which people of some rank or fortune spend the greater part of their lives, are not, like those of the common people, simple and uniform. They are almost all of them extremely complicated, and such as exercise the head more than the hands. The understandings of those who are engaged in such employments can seldom grow torpid for want of exercise. The employments of people of some rank and fortune, besides, are seldom such as harass them from morning to night. They generally have a good deal of leisure, during which they may perfect themselves in every branch either of useful or ornamental knowledge of which they may have laid the foundation, or for which they may have acquired some taste in the earlier part of life.
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It is otherwise with the common people. They have little time to spare for education. Their parents can scarce afford to maintain them even in infancy. As soon as they are able to work, they must apply to some trade by which they can earn their subsistence. That trade too is generally so simple and uniform as to give little exercise to the understanding; while, at the same time, their labour is both so constant and so severe, that it leaves them little leisure and less inclination to apply to, or even to think of anything else.

But though the common people cannot, in any civilized society, be so well instructed as people of some rank and fortune, the most essential parts of education, however, to read, write, and account, can be acquired at so early a period of life, that the greater part even of those who are to be bred to the lowest occupations, have time to acquire them before they can be employed in those occupations. For a very small expence the public can facilitate, can encourage, and can even impose upon almost the whole body of the people, the necessity of acquiring those most essential parts of education.

The public can facilitate this acquisition by establishing in every parish or district a little school, where children may be taught for a reward so moderate, that even a common labourer may afford it; the master being partly, but not wholly paid by the public; because, if he was wholly, or even principally paid by it, he would soon learn to neglect his business.

If in those little schools the books, by which the children are taught to read, were a little more instructive than they commonly are; and if, instead of a little smattering of Latin, which the children of the common place are sometimes taught there, and which can scarce ever be of any use to them; they were instructed in the elementary parts of geometry and mechanics, the literary education of this rank of people would perhaps be as complete as it can be. There is scarce a common trade which does not afford some opportunities of applying to it the principles of geometry and mechanics, and which would not therefore gradually exercise and improve the common people in those principles, the necessary introduction to the most sublime as well as to the most useful sciences.

Questions:
1. What were the costs and benefits of the machines and new divisions of labor? Consider not just the product and the technology, but work location, labor force, consumption, class relations, etc.
2. What hopes and fears were expressed about the future of the new technology?
3. How have these hopes and fears materialized (or not) in the past 200 years? Are the hopes and fears still valid or not?
4. How are workers and manufacturers described and by whom? What conclusions can you draw from these descriptions?
5. How might these descriptions have shaped people’s understanding?
PART 19

The French Revolution

19.1 “The Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen”

The French National Assembly drafted the following statement in the summer of 1789. The king reluctantly accepted the Declaration after Parisian women marched to Versailles, demanding relief from food shortages and high prices. Backed by the new national guard, under the direction of Lafayette, the women brought the king back to Paris (followed soon by the Assembly).


11. The free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of the most precious rights of man: every citizen can therefore freely speak, write, and print: he is answerable for abuses of this liberty in cases determined by the law.
12. The guaranteeing of the rights of man and citizen necessitates a public force; this force is therefore instituted for the advantage of all, and not for the private use of those to whom it is entrusted.
13. For the maintenance of the public force, and for the expenses of administration, a tax supported in common is indispensable; it must be assessed on all citizens in proportion to their capacities to pay.
14. Citizens have the right to determine for themselves or through their representatives the need for taxation of the public, to consent to it freely, to investigate its use, and to determine its rate, basis, collection, and duration.
15. Society has the right to demand an accounting of his administration from every public agent.
16. Any society in which guarantees of rights are not assured nor the separation of powers determined has no constitution.
17. Property being an inviolable and sacred right, no one may be deprived of it unless public necessity, legally determined, clearly requires such action, and then only on condition of a just and prior indemnity.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 19.1–19.4.
1. What do each of these documents proclaim?
2. What limitations, if any, do they accept? Why might they accept or argue for these limitations (consider the audience, the purpose, their position in society)?
3. How does Robespierre link virtue and tenor?
4. Can you explain how the Tenor might have come about? Was this an aberration that derailed the Revolution or a logical outcome of the Revolution?
19.2 “Declaration of the Rights of Women and the Female Citizen”

Olympe de Gouges (Marie Gouze), a self-educated butcher’s daughter, wrote the “Declaration of the Rights of Women and the Female Citizen” in September 1791. She went to the guillotine in 1793 for being a counterrevolutionary (she addressed the Declaration to the Queen, who was beheaded just before de Gouges) and an “unnatural” woman. Shortly thereafter, the National Convention banned women from all public meetings. Instead, women were to stay at home and raise their sons to become virtuous citizens and their daughters to be virtuous mothers.


FOR THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY TO DECREE IN ITS LAST SESSIONS, OR IN THOSE OF THE NEXT LEGISLATURE

Preamble

Mothers, daughters, and sisters [and] representatives of the nation demand to be constituted into a national assembly. Believing that ignorance, omission, or scorn for the rights of woman are the only causes of public misfortunes and of the corruption of governments, [the women] have resolved to set forth in a solemn declaration the natural, inalienable, and sacred rights of women in order that this declaration, constantly exposed before all the members of the society, will ceaselessly remind them of their rights and duties; in order that the authoritative acts of women and the authoritative acts of men may be at any moment compared with and respectful of the purpose of all political institutions; and in order that citizens’ demands, henceforth based on simple and incontestable principles, will always support the constitution, good morals, and the happiness of all.

Consequently, the sex that is as superior in beauty as it is in courage during the sufferings of maternity recognizes and declares in the presence and under the auspices of the Supreme Being, the following Rights of Women and of Female Citizens.

Article I

Woman is born free and lives equal to man in her rights. Social distinctions can be based only on the common utility.

Article II

The purpose of any political association is the conservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of woman and man; these rights are liberty, property, security, and especially resistance to oppression.

Article III

The principle of all sovereignty rests essentially with the nation, which is nothing but the union of woman and man; no body and no individual can exercise any authority which does not come expressly from it [the nation].

Article IV

Liberty and justice consist of restoring all that belongs to others; thus, the only limits on the exercise of the natural rights of woman are perpetual male tyranny; these limits are to be reformed by the laws of nature and reason.

........

Article VI

The law must be the expression of the general will; all female and male citizens must contribute either personally or through their representatives to its formation; it must be the same for all: male and female citizens, being equal in the eyes of the law, must be equally admitted to all honors, positions, and public employment according to their capacity and without other distinctions besides those of their virtues and talents.
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Article VII
No woman is an exception; she is accused, arrested, and detained in cases determined by law. Women, like men, obey this rigorous law.

Article X
No one is to be disquieted for his very basic opinions; woman has the right to mount the scaffold; she must equally have the right to mount the rostrum, provided that her demonstrations do not disturb the legally established public order.

Article XI
The free communication of thoughts and opinions is one of the most precious rights of woman, since that liberty assures the recognition of children by their fathers. Any female citizen thus may say freely, I am the mother of a child which belongs to you, without being forced by a barbarous prejudice to hide the truth; [an exception may be made] to respond to the abuse of this liberty in cases determined by the law.

Article XII
The guarantee of the rights of woman and the female citizen implies a major benefit; this guarantee must be instituted for the advantage of all, and not for the particular benefit of those to whom it is entrusted.

Article XIII
For the support of the public force and the expenses of administration, the contributions of woman and man are equal; she shares all the duties [corvées] and all the painful tasks; therefore, she must have the same share in the distribution of positions, employment, offices, honors, and jobs [industrie].

Article XIV
Female and male citizens have the right to verify, either by themselves or through their representatives, the necessity of the public contribution. This can only apply to women if they are granted an equal share, not only of wealth, but also of public administration, and in the determination of the proportion, the base, the collection, and the duration of the tax.

Article XVII
Property belongs to both sexes whether united or separate; for each it is an inviolable and sacred right; no one can be deprived of it, since it is the true patrimony of nature, unless the legally determined public need obviously dictates it, and then only with a just and prior indemnity.

Postscript
Woman, wake up; the tocsin of reason is being heard throughout the whole universe; discover your rights. The powerful empire of nature is no longer surrounded by prejudice, fanaticism, superstition, and lies. The flame of truth has dispersed all the clouds of folly and usurpation. Enslaved man has multiplied his strength and needs recourse to yours to break his chains. Having become free, he has become unjust to his companion. Oh, women, women! When will you cease to be blind? What advantage have you received from the Revolution? A more pronounced scorn, a more marked disdain. In the centuries of corruption you ruled only over the weakness of men. The reclamation of your patrimony, based on the wise decrees of nature-what have you to dread from such a fine undertaking?
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If they persist in their weakness in putting this non sequitur in contradiction to their principles, courageously oppose the force of reason to the empty pretentions of superiority; unite yourselves beneath the standards of philosophy; deploy all the energy of your character, and you will soon see these haughty men, not groveling at your feet as servile adorers, but proud to share with you the treasures of the Supreme Being. Regardless of what barriers confront you, it is in your power to free yourselves; you have only to want to. Let us pass now to the shocking tableau of what you have been in society; and since national education is in question at this moment, let us see whether our wise legislators will think judiciously about the education of women.

Women have done more harm than good. Constraint and dissimulation have been their lot. What force had robbed them of, ruse returned to them; they had recourse to all the resources of their charms, and the most irreproachable person did not resist them. Poison and the sword were both subject to their indiscretion; they had command in crimes as in fortune. The French government, especially, depended throughout the centuries on the nocturnal administration of women; the cabinet kept no secret from their indiscretion; ambassadorial post, command, ministry, presidency, pontificate, college of cardinals; finally, anything which characterizes the folly of men, profane and sacred, all have been subject to the cupidity and ambition of this sex, formerly contemptible and respected, and since the revolution, respectable and scorned.

I take up my text again on the subject of morals. Marriage is the tomb of trust and love. The married woman can with impunity give bastards to her husband, and also give them the wealth which does not belong to them. The woman who is unmarried has only one feeble right; ancient and inhuman laws refuse to her for her children the right to name and the wealth of their father; no new laws have been made in this matter. If it is considered a paradox and an impossibility on my part to try to give my sex an honorable and just consistency, I leave it to men to attain glory for dealing with this matter; but while we wait, the way can be prepared through national education, the restoration of morals, and conjugal conventions.

**Form for a Social Contract Between Man and Woman**

We, _____ and _____, moved by our own will, unite ourselves for the duration of our lives, and for the duration of our mutual inclinations, under the following conditions: We intend and wish to make our wealth communal, meanwhile reserving to ourselves the right to divide it in favor of our children and of those toward whom we might have a particular inclination, mutually recognizing that our property belongs directly to our children, from whatever bed they come, and that all of them without distinction have the right to bear the name of the fathers and mothers who have acknowledged them, and we are charged to subscribe to the law which punishes the renunciation of one’s own blood. We likewise obligate ourselves, in case of separation, to divide our wealth and to set aside in advance the portion the law indicates for our children, and in the event of a perfect union, the one who dies will divest himself of half his property in his children’s favor, and if one dies childless, the survivor will inherit by right, unless the dying person has disposed of half the common property in favor of one whom he judged deserving.

That is approximately the formula for the marriage act I propose for execution. Upon reading this strange document, I see rising up against me the hypocrites, the prudes, the clergy, and the whole infernal sequence. But how [my proposal] offers to the wise the moral means of achieving the perfection of a happy government!

Moreover, I would like a law which would assist widows and young girls deceived by the false promises of a man to whom they were attached; I would like, I say, this law to force an inconstant man to hold to his obligations or at least [to pay] an indemnity equal to his wealth. Again, I would like this law to be rigorous against women, at least those who have the effrontery to have recourse to a law which they themselves had violated by their misconduct, if proof of that were given. At the same time, as I showed in *Le Bonheur primitif de l’homme*, in 1788, that prostitutes should be placed in designated quarters. It is not prostitutes who contribute the most to the depravity of morals, it is the women of society. In regenerating the latter, the former are changed. This link of fraternal union will first bring disorder, but in consequence it will produce at the end a perfect harmony.

I offer a foolproof way to elevate the soul of women; it is to join them to all the activities of man; if man persists in finding this way impractical, let him share his fortune with woman, not at his caprice, but by the wisdom of laws. Prejudice falls, morals are purified, and nature regains all her rights. Add to this the marriage of priests and the strengthening of the king on his throne, and the French government cannot fail.
It would be very necessary to say a few words on the troubles which are said to be caused by the decree in favor of colored men in our islands. There is where nature shudders with horror: there is where reason and humanity have still not touched callous souls; there, especially, is where division and discord stir up their inhabitants. It is not difficult to divine the instigators of these incendiary fermentations; they are even in the midst of the National Assembly; they ignite the fire in Europe which must inflame America. Colonists make a claim to reign as despots over the men whose father and brothers they are; and, disowning the rights of nature, they trace the source of [their rule] to the scantiest tint of their blood. These inhuman colonists say: our blood flows in their veins, but we will shed it all if necessary to glut our greed or our blind ambition. It is in these places nearest to nature where the father scorns the son; deaf to the cries of blood, they stifle all its attraction; what can be hoped from the resistance opposed to them? To constrain [blood] violently is to render it terrible; to leave [blood] still enchained is to direct all calamities towards America. A divine hand seems to spread liberty abroad throughout the realms of man; only the law has the right to curb this liberty if it degenerates into license, but it must be equal for all; liberty must hold the National Assembly to its decree dictated by prudence and justice. May it act the same way for the state of France and render her as attentive to new abuses as she was to the ancient ones which each day become more dreadful. My opinion would be to reconcile the executive and legislative power, for it seems to me that the one is everything and the other is nothing—whence comes, unfortunately perhaps, the loss of the French Empire. I think that these two powers, like man and woman, should be united but equal in force and virtue to make a good household.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 19.1–19.4.
1. What do each of these documents proclaim?
2. What limitations, if any, do they accept? Why might they accept or argue for these limitations (consider the audience, the purpose, their position in society)?
3. How does Robespierre link virtue and tenor?
4. Can you explain how the Tenor might have come about? Was this an aberration that derailed the Revolution or a logical outcome of the Revolution?
19.3 Petition of Women of the Third Estate

During the time when the French drew up their *Cahiers de Doleance* (their petitions to the Estates General), women were generally excluded. They did not have the right to meet in groups, draft grievances, or vote, except in a few isolated instances. Nevertheless, some women did make their voices heard, as seen in the following petition to the king from working women.

*Sire,*

At a time when the different orders of the state are occupied with their interests; when everyone seeks to make the most of his titles and rights; when some anxiously recall the centuries of servitude and anarchy, while others make every effort to shake off the last links that still bind them to the imperious remains of feudalism; women—continual objects of the admiration and scorn of men—could they not also make their voices heard amidst this general agitation?

Excluded from the national assemblies by laws so well consolidated that they allow no hope of infringement, they do not ask, Sire, for your permission to send their deputies to the Estates General; they know too well how much favor will play a part in the election, and how easy it would be for those elected to impede the freedom of voting.

We prefer, Sire, to place our cause at your feet; not wishing to obtain anything except from your heart, it is to it that we address our complaints and confide our miseries.

The women of the Third Estate are almost all born without wealth; their education is very neglected or very defective: it consists in their being sent to school with a teacher who himself does not know the first word of the language [Latin] he teaches. They continue to go there until they can read the service of the Mass in French and Vespers in Latin. Having fulfilled the first duties of religion, they are taught to work; having reached the age of fifteen or sixteen, they can earn five or six sous a day. If nature has refused them beauty they get married, without a dowry, to unfortunate artisans; lead aimless, difficult lives stuck in the provinces; and give birth to children they are incapable of raising. If, on the contrary, they are born pretty, without breeding, without principles, with no idea of morals, they become the prey of the first seducer, commit a first sin, come to Paris to bury their shame, end by losing it altogether, and die victims of dissolute ways.

Today, when the difficulty of subsisting forces thousands of them to put themselves up for auction [prostitution], when men find it easier to buy them for a short time than to win them over forever, those whom a fortunate penchant inclines to virtue, who are consumed by the desire to learn, who feel themselves carried along by a natural taste, who have overcome the deficiencies of their education and know a little of everything without having learned anything, those, finally, whom a lofty soul, a noble heart, and a pride of sentiment cause to be called prudes, are obliged to throw themselves into cloisters where only a modest dowry is required, or forced to become servants if they do not have enough courage, enough heroism, to share the generous devotion of the girls of Vincent de Paul.1

Also, many, solely because they are born girls, are disdained by their parents, who refuse to set them up, preferring to concentrate their fortune in the hands of a son whom they designate to carry on their name in the capital; for Your Majesty should know that we too have names to keep up. Or, if old age finds them spinsters, they spend it in tears and see themselves the object of the scorn of their nearest relatives.

To prevent so many ills, Sire, we ask that men not be allowed, under any pretext, to exercise trades that are the prerogative of women—whether as seamstress, embroider, millinery shopkeeper, etc., etc.; if we are left at least with the needle and the spindle, we promise never to handle the compass or the square.

We ask, Sire, that your benevolence provide us with the means of making the most of the talents with which nature will have endowed us, notwithstanding the impediments which are forever being placed on our education.

May you assign us positions, which we alone will be able to fill, which we will occupy only after having passed a strict examination, following trustworthy inquiries concerning the purity of our morals.

---

1 Saint Vincent de Paul organized communities for women who served as schoolteachers, nurses, and the like. They took simple vows, did not wear religious costumes, and worked outside in the community rather than staying in their convent. These communities often appealed to poor women but demanded hard work.
We ask to be enlightened, to have work, not in order to usurp men’s authority, but in order to be better esteemed by them, so that we might have the means of living safe from misfortune and so that poverty does not force the weakest among us, who are blinded by luxury and swept along by example, to join the crowd of unfortunate women who over-populate the streets and whose debauched audacity disgraces our sex and the men who keep them company.

We would wish this class of women might wear a mark of identification. Today, when they adopt even the modesty of our dress, when they mingle everywhere in all kinds of clothing, we often find ourselves confused with them; some men make mistakes and make us blush because of their scorn. They should never be able to take off the identification under pain of working in public workshops for the benefit of the poor (it is known that work is the greatest punishment that can be inflicted on them).... However, it occurs to us that the empire of fashion would be destroyed and one would run the risk of seeing many too many women dressed in the same color.

We implore you, Sire, to set up free schools where we might learn our language on the basis of principles, religion and ethics. May one and the other be offered to us in all their grandeur, entirely stripped of the petty applications which attenuate their majesty; may our hearts be formed there; may we be taught above all to practice the virtues of our sex: gentleness, modesty, patience, charity. As for the arts that please, women learn them without teachers. Sciences?... they serve only to inspire us with a stupid pride, lead us to pedantry, go against the wishes of nature, make of us mixed beings who are rarely faithful wives and still more rarely good mothers of families.

We ask to take leave of ignorance, to give our children a sound and reasonable education so as to make of them subjects worthy of serving you. We will teach them to cherish the beautiful name of Frenchmen; we will transmit to them the love we have for Your Majesty. For we are certainly willing to leave valor and genius to men, but we will always challenge them over the dangerous and precious gift of sensibility; we defy them to love you better than we do. They run to Versailles, most of them for their interests, while we, Sire, go to see you there, and when with difficulty and with pounding hearts, we can gaze for an instance upon your August Person, tears flow from our eyes. The idea of Majesty, of the Sovereign, vanishes, and we see in you only a tender Father, for whom we would give our lives a thousand times.

**Questions:**
The following questions pertain to documents 19.1–19.4.

1. What do each of these documents proclaim?
2. What limitations, if any, do they accept? Why might they accept or argue for these limitations (consider the audience, the purpose, their position in society)?
3. How does Robespierre link virtue and tenor?
4. Can you explain how the Tenor might have come about? Was this an aberration that derailed the Revolution or a logical outcome of the Revolution?
19.4 Robespierre: Justification of Terror

In a speech to the National Convention in February 1794, Robespierre, the most prominent of the 12-member Committee of Public Safety, provided a justification for the Reign of Terror. In his praise of virtue, he was contrasting the Republic with the absolute monarchy, which had been discredited as corrupt and riddled with vice.


It is time to mark clearly the aim of the Revolution and the end toward which we wish to move; it is time to take stock of ourselves, of the obstacles which we still face, and of the means which we ought to adopt to attain our objectives....

What is the goal for which we strive? A peaceful enjoyment of liberty and equality, the rule of that eternal justice whose laws are engraved, not upon marble or stone, but in the hearts of all men.

We wish an order of things where all low and cruel passions are enchained by the laws, all beneficent and generous feelings aroused; where ambition is the desire to merit glory and to serve one’s fatherland; where distinctions are born only of equality itself; where the citizen is subject to the magistrate, the magistrate to the people, the people to justice; where the nation safeguards the welfare of each individual, and each individual proudly enjoys the prosperity and glory of his fatherland; where all spirits are enlarged by the constant exchange of republican sentiments and by the need of earning the respect of a great people; where the arts are the adornment of liberty, which ennobles them; and where commerce is the source of public wealth, not simply of monstrous opulence for a few families.

In our country we wish to substitute morality for egotism, probity for honor, principles for conventions, duties for etiquette, the empire of reason for the tyranny of customs, contempt for vice for contempt for misfortune, pride for insolence, the love of honor for the love of money... that is to say, all the virtues and miracles of the Republic for all the vices and snobbishness of the monarchy.

We wish in a word to fulfill the requirements of nature, to accomplish the destiny of mankind, to make good the promises of philosophy... that France, hitherto illustrious among slave states, may eclipse the glory of all free peoples that have existed, become the model of all nations.... That is our ambition; that is our aim.

What kind of government can realize these marvels? Only a democratic government.... But to found and to consolidate among us this democracy, to realize the peaceable rule of constitutional laws, it is necessary to conclude the war of liberty against tyranny and to pass successfully through the storms of revolution. Such is the aim of the revolutionary system which you have set up....

Now what is the fundamental principle of democratic, or popular government—that is to say, the essential main-spring upon which it depends and which makes it function? It is virtue: I mean public virtue... that virtue which is nothing else but love of fatherland and its laws....

The splendor of the goal of the French Revolution is simultaneously the source of our strength and of our weakness: our strength, because it gives us an ascendancy of truth over falsehood, and of public rights over private interests; our weakness, because it rallies against us all vicious men, all those who in their hearts seek to despoil the people.... It is necessary to stifle the domestic and foreign enemies of the Republic or perish with them. Now in these circumstances, the first maxim of our politics ought to be to lead the people by means of reason and the enemies of the people by terror.

If the basis of popular government in time of peace is virtue, the basis of popular government in time of revolution is both virtue and terror: virtue without which terror is murderous, terror without which virtue is powerless. Terror is nothing else than swift, severe, indomitable justice; it flows, then, from virtue.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 19.1–19.4.
1. What do each of these documents proclaim?
2. What limitations, if any, do they accept? Why might they accept or argue for these limitations (consider the audience, the purpose, their position in society)?
3. How does Robespierre link virtue and tenor?
4. Can you explain how the Tenor might have come about? Was this an aberration that derailed the Revolution or a logical outcome of the Revolution?
19.5 Louis XVI: A Royal Reform Proposal, 1787

The reform efforts of Louis XVI (1754–1793) can best be summed up as too little too late. From the vantage point of 1787, Louis saw his political and fiscal situation as serious, but unremarkable. As later events would demonstrate, Louis’ confidence that he and his people shared similar views of France’s problems and similar ideas about the best solutions was, to say the least, misplaced.


“The projects that will be communicated to you on my behalf are large and important. On the one hand, it is my intention to increase the state’s income, and make sure that it is no longer eaten up by debt payments, by a fairer system of taxes. On the other hand, the views that I have adopted after lengthy consideration are to free commerce from the different obstacles that hinder it, and to aid my poorest subjects to the fullest extent that circumstances permit. Since these [projects] all aim at promoting the public welfare, and since I know you are all eager to be of service to me, I have no fear about consulting you about the details of their execution . . . I am sure that your opinions will all tend in the same direction, and that it will therefore be easy to reconcile them. Surely no selfish interest will oppose the general interest.”

Question:
1. Did these attempted reforms ultimately succeed? Why or why not?
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19.6 Edmund Burke: The Moral Imagination

And advocate of reform, Edmund Burke (1729–1797) nonetheless believed that existing institutions were the best vehicles for the achievement of progress. Thus, he supported change from within and opposed revolution. In the excerpt from his writings included here, Burke bemoaned the results of revolution in France.


It is now sixteen or seventeen years since I saw the queen of France, then the dauphiness, at Versailles; and surely never lighted on this orb, which she hardly seemed to touch, a more delightful vision. I saw tier just above the horizon, decorating and cheering the elevated sphere she just began to move in—glittering like the morning-star, full of life, and splendour, and joy. Oh! what a revolution! and what an heart must I have, to contemplate without emotion that elevation and that fall! Little did I dream when she added titles of veneration to those of enthusiastick, distant, respectful love, that she should ever be obliged to carry the sharp antidote against disgrace concealed in that bosom; little did I dream that I should have lived to see such disasters fallen upon her in a nation of gallant men, in a nation of men of honour, and of cavaliers. I thought ten thousand swords must have leaped from their scabbards to avenge even a look that threatened her with insult. But the age of chivalry is gone. That of sophisters, economists, and calculators, has succeeded; and the glory of Europe is extinguished for ever. Never, never more, shall we behold that generous loyalty to rank and sex, that proud submission, that dignified obedience, that subordination of the heart, which kept alive, even in servitude itself, the spirit of an exalted freedom. The unbought grace of life, the cheap defence of nations, the nurse of manly sentiment and heroick enterprise is gone! It is gone, that sensibility of principle, that chastity of honour, which felt a stain like a wound, which inspired courage whilst it mitigated ferocity, which ennobled whatever it touched, and under which vice itself lost half its evil, by losing all its grossness.

This mixed system of opinion and sentiment had its origin in the ancient chivalry; and the principle, though varied in its appearance by the varying state of human affairs, subsisted and influenced through a long succession of generations, even to the time we live in. If it should ever be totally extinguished, the loss I fear will be great. It is this which has given its character to modern Europe. It is this which has distinguished it under all its forms of government, and distinguished it to its advantage, from the states of Asia, and possibly from those states which flourished in the most brilliant periods of the antique world. It was this, which, without confounding ranks, had produced a noble equality, and handed it down through all the gradations of social life. It was this opinion which mitigated kings into companions, and raised private men to be fellows with kings. Without force, or opposition, it subdued the fierceness of pride and power; it obliged sovereigns to submit to the soft collar of social esteem, compelled stern authority to submit to elegance, and gave a domination vanquisher of laws, to be subdued by manners.

But now all is to be changed. All the pleasing illusions, which made power gentle, and obedience liberal, which harmonized the different shades of life, and which, by a bland assimilation, incorporated into politicks the sentiments which beautify and soften private society, are to be dissolved by this new conquering empire of light and reason. All the decent drapery of life is to be rudely torn off. All the superadded ideas, furnished from the wardrobe of a moral imagination, which the heart owns, and the understanding ratifies, as necessary to cover the defects of our naked, shivering nature, and to raise it to dignity in our own estimation, are to be exploded as a ridiculous, absurd, and antiquated fashion.

On this scheme of things, a king is but a man, a queen is but a woman; a woman is but an animal; and an animal not of the highest order. All homage paid to the sex in general as such, and without distinct views, is to be regarded as romance and folly. Regicide, and parricide, and sacrilege, are but fictions of superstition, corrupting jurisprudence by destroying its simplicity. The murder of a king, or a queen, or a bishop, or a father, are only common homicide; and if the people are by any chance, or in any way gainers by it, a sort of homicide much the most pardonable, and into which we ought not to make too severe a scrutiny.
On the scheme of this barbarous philosophy, which is the offspring of cold hearts and muddy understandings, and which is as void of solid wisdom, as it is destitute of all taste and elegance, laws are to be supported only by their own terrors, and by the concern, which each individual may find in them, from his own private speculations, or can spare to them from his own private interest. In the groves of their academy, at the end of every vista, you see nothing but the gallows. Nothing is left which engages the affections on the part of the commonwealth. On the principles of this mechanick philosophy, our institutions can never be embodied, if I may use the expression, in persons; so as to create in us love, veneration, admiration, or attachment. But that sort of reason which banishes the affections is incapable of filling their place. These publick affections, combined with manners, are required sometimes as supplements, sometimes as correctives, always as aids to law. The precept given by a wise man, as well as a great critic, for the construction of poems, is equally true as to states:—*Non satis est pulchra esse poemata, dulcia sunto.*¹ There ought to be a system of manners in every nation, which a well-formed mind would be disposed to relish. To make us love our country, our country ought to be lovely.

But power, of some kind or other, will survive the shock in which manners and opinions perish, and it will find other and worse means for its support. The usurpation which, in order to subvert ancient institutions, has destroyed ancient principles, will hold power by arts similar to those by which it has acquired it. When the old feudal and chivalrous spirit of fealty, which, by freeing kings from fear, freed both kings and subjects from the precaution of tyranny, shall be extinct in the minds of men, plots and assassinations will be anticipated by preventive murder and preventive confiscation, and that long roll of grim and bloody maxims, which form the political code of all power, not standing on its own honour, and the honour of those who are to obey it. Kings will be tyrants by policy, when subjects are rebels from principle.

When ancient opinions and rules of life are taken away, the loss cannot possibly be estimated. From that moment we have no compass to govern us; nor can we know distinctly to what port we steer. Europe, undoubtedly, taken in a mass, was in a flourishing condition the day on which your revolution was completed. How much of that prosperous state was owing to the spirit of our old manners and opinions is not easy to say; but as such causes cannot be indifferent in their operation, we must presume, that, on the whole, their operation was beneficial.

We are but too apt to consider things in the state in which we find them, without sufficiently adverting to the causes by which they have been produced, and possibly may be upheld. Nothing is more certain, than that our manners, our civilization, and all the good things which are connected with manners, and with civilization, have, in this European world of ours, depended for ages upon two principles; and were indeed the result of both combined; I mean the spirit of a gentleman, and the spirit of religion. The nobility and the clergy, the one by profession, the other by patronage, kept learning in existence, even in the midst of arms and confusions, and whilst governments were rather in their causes, than formed. Learning paid back what it received to nobility and to priesthood; and paid it with usury, by enlarging their ideas, and by furnishing their minds. Happy if they had all continued to know their indissoluble union, and their proper place! Happy if learning, not debauched by ambition, had been satisfied to continue the instructor, and not aspired to be the master! Along with its natural protectors and guardians, learning will be cast into the mire; and trodden down under the hoofs of a swinish multitude.

If, as I suspect, modern letters owe more than they are always willing to own to ancient manners, so do other interests which we value full as much as they are worth. Even commerce, and trade, and manufacture, the gods of our economical politicians, are themselves perhaps but creatures; are themselves but effects, which, as first causes, we choose to worship. They certainly grew under the same shade in which learning flourished. They too may decay with their natural protecting principles. With you, for the present at least, they all threaten to disappear together. Where trade and manufactures are wanting to a people, and the spirit of nobility and religion remains, sentiment supplies, and not always ill supplies, their place; but if commerce and the arts should be lost in an experiment to try how well a state may stand without these old fundamental principles, what sort of a thing must be a national gross, stupid, ferocious, and, at the same time, poor and sordid barbarians, destitute of religion, honour, or manly pride, possessing nothing at present, and hoping for nothing hereafter?

**Question:**

1. What is the moral imagination?

¹“It is not enough for poems to be beautiful, let them be pleasing.” (Horace, *Ars Poetica* 99.) [R. K.]
20.1 A View from the Field: A Napoleonic Soldier

This document offers the perspective of a soldier in Napoleon’s army


On 1 May 1804 the major called me to his office to inform me that I had been made a corporal on the recommendation of Captain Lavigne and that I would be confirmed in the rank at the Sunday parade the following day. He told me, moreover, that I would be sent in my new rank as one of a detachment which was going to join the patrols stationed on the Atlantic coast. My troop was at Lannion.

On 15 May I was given a friendly reception when I arrived at Lannion, but I had to stand my fellow corporals a dinner at the Arbre Vert hotel to celebrate my stripes. Eight meals at 3 francs apiece put me very much in favour with my new comrades who swore me their friendship—and who kept their word. It was not long, however, before I noticed that my stripes had caused some jealousy in the troop.

A month after my arrival I was on duty and was inspecting the rooms. I noticed in the weapons-rack a sabre which was not up to the required standard of cleanliness and I reprimanded Chasseur Hayer to whom it belonged. He retorted that only a newcomer would have the nerve to criticise an older member of the troop and that if I would like to try out my sabre against his, he would prove that he was the better man.

At this unexpected insubordination I did not give the chasseur four days punishments as I should have done; instead, I accepted this challenge and a quarter of an hour later I was waiting outside the barracks for my opponent. He was not long in coming and the duel took place immediately.

I received a deep wound on the instep. Blood gushed out of the wound and I fell down on the spot. Four chasseurs came and picked me up and then carried me to the civilian hospital in Lannion which was run by the Sisters of Charity.

My wound was so serious that I might have had to have my foot amputated or at least be forced to walk with a limp for the rest of my life. My extreme youth and the purity of my blood saved me.

I was made to pay 7 francs 50 centimes for them at the end of

But to return to 13 October 1806, the eve of the battle of Jena. By a series of forced marches the regiment had reached its appointed position. That day we bivouacked in the fields near the village where the marshal’s headquarters had been set up. There was also an infantry division in the village and this division was to occupy an important pass through which the army was to advance the following day, 14 October, in order to reach the field of battle at Jena where the whole Prussian army had assembled.

Because of the proximity of the village of Gera we were able to have supplies of sheep and geese for these are raised in great numbers in Saxony. Our encampment was in a potato field and we dug up the potatoes with our bayonets. The regiment had just been issued with these new weapons, but this was the only use we made of them; in fact, we threw them away before we went into action. Needless to say, we were made to pay 7 francs 50 centimes for them at the end of
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the campaign, but we had rid ourselves of a cumbersome weapon which we found useless.

... ...

The dull reverberations of le brutal, as we called the cannon, could be heard, producing that uneasy feeling which all soldiers know.

... ...

‘Quartermaster, have you a good horse?’
‘Yes sir.’
‘Well stay close to me. You will be my orderly for the rest of the day.’

Sergeant-Major Isnard who had been with him had just been struck down by a cannon-ball. So it was that I remained with my colonel, feeling very proud of my new position which I preferred to my normal position of serrefile at the rear of the compagnie d’élite.

I was not yet twenty years old and had been in the army for four years. This was the first time that I had seen the enemy. I had the worthy desire to distinguish myself in action and I was pleased to have my first opportunity in front of my colonel.

When the compagnie d’élite had reached the plateau beyond the pass, the colonel ordered Captain Fleury who commanded it to take up position on the left of the 7th Chasseurs and to maintain the proper distance between the two regiments on the field of battle. Then he said to me:

‘Quartermaster, stay near the pass and tell Captain Sabinet of the 5th Troop to proceed at a trot to his position to the left of the compagnie d’élite. Pass on the same order to all the troops down to the last one. Then come back to me at the gallop; I shall be at the centre of the regiment.’

The colonel left and I carried out my task. While I was so engaged many wounded came past me on their way to the field hospital. I shall always remember a sergeant of the 5th Hussars, a man of truly martial appearance, whose white pelisse was completely covered in blood. He had just had his left arm shattered by a cannon-ball and yet he did not cease telling the chasseurs of our regiment whom he met as they advanced up the pass: ‘Come on, my brave chasseurs! The Prussians are not all that bad!’

These words probably meant: ‘Before le brutal hit me, I got among the enemy with my sabre.’

... ...

At about two o’clock in the afternoon an enormous mass of cavalry started to come forward at us at walking pace. The snow and the marshy ground made this the only pace possible. As the enemy cheers rang in the air Colonel Castex asked if the carbines were loaded. When told that they were, he ordered: ‘Take aim!’ Then he ordered the officers to fall in with the men and did so himself. The enormous mass of dragoons was still coming at us at walking pace, but the colonel remained unmoved.

When it was six yards away he ordered sharply: ‘Fire!’ The regiment carried out this order with drill-like precision. Consequently, the effect of the volley was terrible. Almost the whole of the enemy front rank was struck down. The enemy hesitated a moment, but soon the dead and wounded were replaced by the second rank and a mêlée developed.

Without the presence of mind of Capital Kirmann, the regiment would have been seriously threatened, for a group of Cossacks had come round to attack us from the left and so catch the regiment between two fires. Captain Kirmann’s timely order for one of the squadron to face to the left thwarted the Russian plan.

This mass of cavalry was unable to break our line and finally it turned back, but not without having inflicted heavy losses upon us. More than a hundred men of the 20th Chasseurs were killed or wounded. The enemy left at least three hundred dead on the field for the battalion in square of the 27th Infantry Regiment caused great losses among the Russians by its well-aimed fire when the enemy retreated.

The Emperor had taken up a position which overlooked the whole battle and his eagle eye did not miss a single phase of it. He had seen the critical position of the 4th Corps artillery park and he had been delighted to see the Russian cavalry cut down, smashed and put to flight. He immediately despatched one of his generals who was acting as an aide-de-camp to congratulate the 20th. When the general arrived the chasseurs greeted him with cries of ‘Long live the Emperor!’ and brandished their blood-stained sabres.

The day of 8 February 1807 at Eylau was a glorious one for the whole army

... ...

[when captured] The Cossacks pulled me from beneath my horse and searched me. They took away my belt in which they found a few gold fredericks. The greater part of my wealth was in the collar of my coat or transformed into buttons. My friend Henry had taught me this way of concealing from the enemy what little wealth I had. Since we had left Holland our
uniform had changed. Long coats, overalls and half-boots had replaced the dolman and riding-breeches. Our new uniform was such that there were a good number of buttons for which fredericks could be substituted and consequently I was able to keep some forty of them after my capture. Whenever I had need of money I simply undid the stitching of my collar or removed a button.

During these four years I had taken part in the Prussian campaign of 1806, the Eylau campaign of 1807 (when I had been wounded and taken prisoner), and the campaign of 1809 when I had been shot in the right arm. I might add that, to use the Emperor’s expression, if I had been wounded, this had not happened without my wounding quite a few of the enemy. The only reward for my seven years of service, however, was a second lieutenant’s modest epaulette. Yet this was a time for self-sacrifice. Ambition was satisfied by the very act of fighting so that our country would triumph over its enemies, so that France would deserve her title of La Grande Nation. The Emperor rewarded us for our sleepless nights, our exhaustion and our wounds with these words: ‘Soldiers, I am pleased with you; you have surpassed my expectations.’

In 1810 I had just turned twenty-three; I was both proud and happy; I was an officer in the French Army!

At Salamanca my duties as adjutant obtained for me excellent quarters in the house of a beautiful Spanish noblewoman, Doña Rosa de la N... whose husband, a colonel in the Spanish army, had died two years previously. Like any widow who still retains a touch of vanity she had instructed her maid to say she was twenty-five and this was the answer I received when I sought this detail from the maid. But this little lie, if indeed it was one, was not at all necessary for, whatever her age, Doña Rosa was one of the most enchanting women I have ever seen in my life.

‘General Fournier has ordered me to carry out a series of sweeps throughout the province of Leon and to employ the tactics of the guerrillas themselves. I have complete freedom of action; I can go in whichever direction seems best to me and I can move by night rather than by day if it means surprising the enemy. In our present role speed is of the utmost importance; there will be only two trumpet calls, one to mount and the other to dismount.’

We rode for nine days without encountering any guerrillas. It was not that there were none in the region, but the local population warned them of our arrival and as their function was not to engage forces against which they were almost certain to be defeated, they did not allow us to catch up with them. However, on the tenth day as we were returning to Salamanca I suddenly came upon the band led by El Pastor1 at the ford across the Tormes three leagues above the town. Half his men were already on the other bank and the remainder could not stand up to a powerful charge by our chasseurs. We killed several of them, others were drowned in the river, and the ten who were taken prisoner bore the number of our regiment, as our expression was, where our sabres had marked them.

Before he dismissed me, the major gave me orders for our departure in two day’s time. Then he went to report to the general and I hastened to Doña Rosa’s house. When I arrived at the door I looked up at the window, but I was not rewarded for the curtains were not moving and I supposed that she had gone out. I soon learned otherwise;

I tried to enter Doña Rosa’s room by means of a door which only I used, but the key had been removed. [... On The Next day]

During the entire meal she spoke only of quite unimportant matters, without making the slightest reference to my absence. I became increasingly irritated and yet I contained my impatience. When the servants had left and we were finally alone, I asked her openly: ‘Madame, would you be good enough to explain your extraordinary attitude towards me? I am more than anxious to make amends if I have offended you in any way.

‘What!’ she said, ‘do you think I could have received you when you were still covered with the blood of my fellow-countrymen?’

‘But I am innocent of your charge. If we should fall into the hands of the guerrillas, we are put to death, but the fellow-countrymen to whom you refer were taken prisoner by me and I took no reprisals against them. Everyone saw them when they were brought back to the town.’

She seemed to soften a little when she heard what I had to say, but I was so tactless as to add: ‘But my lovely Doña Rosa, you are so patriotic!’

At these words she seized a small dagger which she always carried with her and, holding its point against my chest, she said with such ferocity that the words still ring in my ears: ‘Of course I am patriotic! Charles, I am very fond...
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of you, much too fond of you, for my duty should not allow me such feelings. But if I could free my country from the presence of foreign troops merely by plunging this blade in your heart, you would die at my hands.

Then she hastened to add: ‘But you may rest assured that my own death would follow immediately.’

‘Madame, I much prefer you with your castanets and your tambourine. You should stop this tragic act; it is so unladylike.’

The general selected me to carry an important despatch to General Kellermann at Valladolid. He authorized me to take twenty-five chasseurs as an escort. I suggested to him that as the distance was not even fifteen leagues I could undertake the mission with only my servant if I left in the evening.

Great was my astonishment, however, when I rode into the courtyard and saw that it was full of men, horses and mules. I thought at first they were a band of smugglers, but I soon learned otherwise when I saw the carbines and pistols which were levelled at us. I had stumbled across a band of guerrillas led by Lieutenant d’Aguillard [José de Aguilar]. Resistance was useless, but I maintained a firm and resolute attitude.

When I had been disarmed and taken before the leader, I said to him: ‘My life is in your hands because of my own carelessness. You should, however, be grateful for this carelessness; if I had had an escort, you would have been taken by surprise and you would be in my hands. Do not forget moreover, that if you harm a single hair of our heads, tomorrow ten of your comrades who are prisoners at Salamanca will be shot.’

I fell silent and casually took the cigar that Lieutenant d’Aguillard was smoking from his mouth—this is a great honour among Spaniards. I put it in my mouth and without revealing my feelings sat down calmly to wait for our fate to be decided.

Complete silence followed. Then the leader of the band translated my words for the others. After a short while he got up and said: ‘Hombre demonio, our decision is not influenced by the fate of our comrades. They would know how to die like good Spaniards for God and their country. But we shall not free our country from its oppressors by killing you. We admire you for your attitude. You are spared! Take back your weapons and let us be friends for a few moments while you partake of all the hospitality that a guerrilla chief can extend to you.’

I must admit that during the further year I spent in Spain I always made a point of helping any Spaniard we took and I think I earned the gratitude of a considerable number of them.

Between the 20th and the 30th of May I and my troop were part of the squadron of chasseurs (who were more frequently known as guides when in the field), which was directly under the Emperor’s orders. In wartime the Emperor always had at his disposal four squadrons drawn from the different arms of the Old Guard cavalry; these he could throw against the enemy if the need arose. The squadron of chasseurs had a special task. A lieutenant, a sergeant, two corporals, twenty-two chasseurs and a trumpeter rode in front of and behind the Emperor. A corporal and four chasseurs galloped ahead of the Emperor and cleared a way for him. One of the chasseurs carried his despatch case and another his field-glass. If the Emperor stopped and dismounted, these chasseurs would immediately do likewise, fix their bayonets to their carbines and move about in a square with the Emperor in the centre of it. The officer commanding the escort troop followed him constantly. Only Murat and the Prince de Neufchâtel had precedence over this officer.

If the Emperor took quarters in a house, this officer occupied the room nearest to that of the Emperor. The chasseurs in the escort troop dismounted and stood holding their horses in front of the house occupied by the Emperor, who always had one of his own horses held in readiness there by two grooms. This troop was relieved every two hours so that the same arrangements held good whatever the time of day or night. The first person the Emperor saw on leaving his rooms was the officer in charge of the escort. It was a post of great honour and responsibility. This body of men was entirely devoted to the Emperor and was, moreover, well rewarded for its devotion. In each troop there were four chasseurs who received not only the cross of the Légion d’honneur and the cross of the Couronne de Fer with its income of 250 francs, but also dividends from the canal companies or the Mont de Milan which brought them between 500 and 800 francs. None of these fine men was lacking in gratitude towards his Emperor.
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to accept, without stopping, the bread, brandy, ham and sausages offered to them by the good citizens who were overjoyed
to see French troops again after being made to quarter the Russians and the Prussians who had behaved very badly in this
unfortified and peaceful town.

I had covered nearly three leagues when I came across a small village in flames. Its inhabitants had abandoned it
to seek refuge in the woods in the middle of winter rather than submit to the brutal treatment of the enemy soldiers. I had
the place searched in the hope of perhaps finding some old man who could give me information about the enemy’s move-
ments, but my men had no success. Then a sergeant whom I had ordered to dismount came to tell me that in the very last
house in the village, the only one untouched by the flames, he had discovered some stragglers from the Russian army. They
were stretched out by the kitchen fire, probably waiting for their meal to cook. The sergeant added that with a few other
chasseurs he could capture these enemy infantrymen. This he did most skilfully. He ordered his men to aim their carbines
through the window at the hearth around which the Russians were sleeping peacefully. The enemy soldiers must have
been terrified to hear the bullets which whistled past their cars when the sergeant gave the word to open fire.

Immediately after the volley the sergeant and his men rushed into the room with sabres drawn and captured the
Russians, none of whom was wounded. He then brought them back to the squadron which I had drawn up at the entrance
to the village.

If it had not been for the fact that at that time France had been invaded by the Coalition armies, I would have
found some amusement in the capture of an enormous cooking-pot in which some thirty chickens, a number of hams,
potatoes and other ingredients were stewing. The bread, which had already been cut up in the room, completed a delicious
meal of which the troop from my own squadron quickly took advantage.

According to the strict laws of war, and in view of the isolated position I was in, I should have had the Russian
grenadiers shot immediately for I had come upon them in a village which the enemy had set on fire. But their lives were
spared by the Emperor’s order that I should take some prisoners for him. I even went so far as to let them have some of
the food they had prepared.

I pushed forward once more, leaving my prisoners with the sergeant commanding the rearguard.

[After coming across the enemy force.]

I gave my men and their horses time to rest and then I moved slowly forward with my squadron on the unpaved
side of the road until I saw the enemy a hundred yards away.

At the first enemy challenge I ordered the squadron to advance at the gallop. We brushed aside the mounted
sentry and took the outpost and the main post completely by surprise. Spreading alarm and confusion, we galloped through
Oulchy-le-Château until we came to the Russian and Prussian bivouacs. The enemy awoke to find himself being cut down
and run through by the chasseurs and the lancers and fired at by the pistols and carbines of the dragoons and the
Mamelukes. My squadron had been deliberately made up of men from each of these arms of the Old Guard.

Taken by surprise in this daring night attack, the enemy thought that several cavalry regiments had come down on
him. He was completely routed and lost many killed and wounded.

Questions:
1. What did warfare entail? Consider weapons, command structure, tactics, living conditions (food,
   shelter etc.), and relations among men.
2. In what ways did soldiers and civilians interact? Why?
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20.2 A View from the Other Side: A British Soldier

This selection is from a soldier in the British army fighting against Napoleon.


CAMPAIGN OF 1812: THE STORMING OF BADAJOS—

At this period of the year (February, March) the coursing in this part of Spain is capital, and by help of my celebrated dog Moro and two other excellent ones, I supplied the officers’ mess of every Company with hares for soup. We had a short repose, for the army moved into Estremadura for the purpose of besieging Badajos. We Light, 3rd and 4th Divisions, thought, as we had taken Ciudad Rodrigo, others would have the pleasure of the trenches of Badajos, but on our reaching Elvas [17 Feb., 1812] we were very soon undeceived, and we were destined for the duty,—to our mortification, for soldiers hate sieges and working-parties. The Guards work better than any soldiers, from their habits in London. Badajos was invested by the 3rd, 4th, and Light Divisions on the Spanish side, or left bank of the river, and by the 5th Division on the Portuguese side, or right bank. On the night of the 17th March, St. Patrick’s Day, the Light Division broke ground under a deluge of rain, which swelled the Guadiana so as to threaten our bridge of boats. Our duties in the trenches were most laborious during the whole siege, and much hard fighting we had, sorties, etc. The night [26 Mar.]

part of the 3rd Division

were to compose the storming party. The Light Division, the working party, consequently were sent to the Engineer Park for the ladders. When they arrived, General Kempt ordered them to be planted (Sir H. Hardinge, D.Q.M.G. of the Portuguese army, was here distinguished). The boys of the 3rd Division said to our fellows, “Come, stand out of the way;” to which our fellows replied, “D—your eyes, do you think we Light Division fetch ladders for such chaps as you to climb up? Follow us”—springing on the ladders, and, many of them were knocked over. A notorious fellow, a Sergeant Brotherwood, a noble fellow on duty, told me this anecdote. The siege was prosecuted with the same vigour from without with which it was repelled from within.

After some hours in the trenches, when we returned I invariably ate and went out coursing, and many is the gallant course I had, and many the swift hare I and my dog Moro brought home from the right bank of the Guadiana.

On the night of the 6th April the 3rd Division were to storm the citadel, the 4th and Light the great breach, the 5th the Olivença Gate, and to escalade, if possible.

Old Alister Cameron, who was in command of four Companies of the 95th Regiment, extended along the counterscape to attract the enemy’s fire, while the column planted their ladders and descended, came up to Barnard and said, “Now my men are ready; shall I begin?” “No, certainly not,” says Barnard. The breach and the works were full of the enemy, looking quietly at us, but not fifty yards off and most prepared, although not firing a shot. So soon as our ladders were all ready posted, and the column in the very act to move and rush down the ladders, Barnard called out, “Now, Cameron!” and the first shot from us brought down such a hail of fire as I shall never forget, nor ever saw before or since. It was most murderous. We flew down the ladders and rushed at the breach, but we were broken, and carried no weight with us, although every soldier was a hero. The breach was covered by a breastwork from behind, and ably defended on the top by chevaux-de-frises of sword-blades, sharp as razors, chained to the ground; while the ascent to the top of the breach was covered with planks with sharp nails in them. However, devil a one did I feel at this moment. One of the officers of the forlorn hope, Lieut. Taggart of the 43rd, was hanging on my arm—a mode we adopted to help each other up, for the ascent was most difficult and steep. A Rifleman stood among the sword-blades on the top of one of the chevaux-de-frises. We made a glorious rush to follow, but, alas! in vain. He was knocked over. My old captain, O’Hare, who commanded the storming party, was killed. All were awfully wounded except, I do believe, myself and little Freer of the 43rd. I had been some seconds at the revêtement of the bastion near the breach, and my red-coat pockets were literally filled with chips of stones splintered by musket-balls. Those not knocked down were driven back by this hail of mortality to the ladders. At the foot of them I saw poor Colonel Macleod with his hands on his breast—the man who lent me his horse when wounded at the bridge on the Coa. He said, “Oh, Smith, I am mortally wounded. Help me up the ladder.” I said, “Oh no,
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dear fellow!” “I am,” he said; “be quick!” I did so, and came back again. Little Freer and I said.” Let us throw down the ladders; the fellows shan’t go out.” Some soldiers behind said, “D— your eyes, if you do we will bayonet you!” and we were literally forced up with the crowd. My sash had got loose, and one end of it was fast in the ladder, and the bayonet was very nearly applied, but the sash by pulling became loose. So soon as we got on the glacis, up came a fresh Brigade of the Portuguese of the 4th Division. I never saw any soldiers behave with more pluck. Down into the ditch we all went again, but the more we tried to get up, the more we were destroyed. The 4th Division followed us in marching up to the breach, and they made a most uncommon noise. The French saw us, but took no notice. Sir Charles Colville, commanding the 4th Division (Cole having been wounded at Albuera), made a devil of a noise, too, on the glacis. Both Divisions were fairly beaten back; we never carried either breach (nominally there were two breaches).

After the attacks upon the breaches, some time before daylight Lord Fitzroy Somerset came to our Division. I think I was almost the first officer who spoke to him. He said, “Where is Barnard?” I didn’t know, but I assured his Lordship he was neither killed nor wounded. A few minutes after his Lordship said that the Duke desired the Light and 4th Divisions to storm again. “The devil!” says I. “Why, we have had enough; we are all knocked to pieces.” Lord Fitzroy says, “I dare say, but you must try again.” I smiled and said, “If we could not succeed with two whole fresh and unscathed Divisions, we are likely to make a poor show of it now. But we will try again with all our might.” Scarcely had this conversation occurred when a bugle sounded within the breach, indicating what had occurred at the citadel and Puerto de Qlivença; and here ended all the fighting. Our fellows would have gone at it again when collected and put into shape, but we were just as well pleased that our attempt had so attracted the attention of the enemy as greatly to facilitate that success which assured the prize contended for.

Now comes a scene of horror I would willingly bury in oblivion. The atrocities committed by our soldiers on the poor innocent and defenceless inhabitants of the city, no words suffice to depict. Civilized man, when let loose and the bonds of morality relaxed, is a far greater beast than the savage, more refined in his cruelty, more fiend-like in every act; and oh, too truly did our heretofore noble soldiers disgrace themselves, though the officers exerted themselves to the utmost to repress it, many who had escaped the enemy being wounded in their merciful attempts!

Questions:
1. What did warfare entail? Consider weapons, command structure, tactics, living conditions (food, shelter etc.), and relations among men.
2. In what ways did soldiers and civilians interact? Why?
20.3 The French View

This excerpt is from Napoleon’s personal secretary, Bourrienne. He reproduces Napoleon’s proclamation to the soldiers on the eve of their mission and then explains Napoleon’s efforts in Egypt concerning religion and learning.

Soldiers,—You are about to undertake a conquest the effects of which on civilisation and commerce are incalculable. The blow you are about to give to England will be the best aimed, and the most sensibly felt, she can receive until the time arrive when you can give her her death-blown.

We must make some fatiguing marches; we must fight several battles; we shall succeed in all we undertake. The destinies are with us. The Mameluke * Beys, who favour exclusively English commerce, whose extortions oppress our merchants and who tyrannise over the unfortunate inhabitants of the Nile, a few days after our arrival will no longer exist.

The people amongst whom we are going to live are Mahometans. The first article of their faith is this: “There is no God but God, and Mahomet in His prophet.” Do not contradict them. Behave to them as you have behaved to the Jews—to the Italians. Pay respect to their muftis, and their Imaums, as you did to the rabbis and the bishops. Extend to the ceremonies prescribed by the Koran and to the mosques the same toleration which you showed to the synagogues, to the religion of Moses and of Jesus Christ.

The Roman legions protected all religions. You will find here customs different from those of Europe. You must accommodate yourselves to them. The people amongst whom we are to mix differ from us in the treatment of women; but in all countries he who violates is a monster. Pillage enriches only a small number of men; it dishonours us; it destroys our resources; it converts into enemies the people whom it is our interest to have for friends.

The first town we shall come to was built by Alexander. At every step we shall meet with grand recollections, worthy of exciting the emulation of Frenchmen.

BOURRIENNE’S ACCOUNT

On the 21st of August, Bonaparte established at Cairo an institute of the arts and sciences.

In founding this Institute, Bonaparte wished to afford an example of his ideas of civilisation. The minutes of the sittings of that learned body, which have been printed, bear evidence of its utility, and of Napoleon’s extended views. The objects of the Institute were the advancement and propagation of information in Egypt, and the study and publication of all facts relating to the natural history, trade, and antiquities of the ancient country.

On the 18th, Bonaparte was present at the ceremony of opening the dike of the canal of Cairo, which receives the water of the Nile when it reaches the height fixed by the Mequyas.

Two days after came the anniversary festival of the birth of Mahomet. At this Napoleon was also present, in company with the sheik El Bekri.

It has been alleged that Bonaparte, when in Egypt, took part in the religious ceremonies and worship of the Mussulmans; but it cannot be said that he celebrated the festivals of the overflowing of the Nile and the anniversary of the Prophet. The Turks invited him to these merely as a spectator, and the presence of their new master was gratifying to the people. But he never committed the folly of ordering any solemnity. He neither learned nor repeated any prayer of the Koran, as many persons have asserted; neither did he advocate fatalism, polygamy, or any other doctrine of the Koran.

---

* Traditional Egyptian rulers who had reasserted their authority with the waning of Ottoman control.

* Muslims
The ceremonies, at which policy induced him to be present, were to him, and to all who accompanied him, mere matters of curiosity. He never set foot in a mosque;

His religious tolerance was the natural consequence of his philosophic spirit.

Doubtless Bonaparte did, as he was bound to do, show respect for the religion of the country; and he found it necessary to act more like a Mussulman than a Catholic. A wise conqueror supports his triumphs by protecting and even elevating the religion of the conquered people. Bonaparte’s principle was, as he himself has often told me, to look upon religions as the work of men, but to respect them everywhere as a powerful engine of government. However, I will not go so far as to say that he would not have changed his religion had the conquest of the East been the price of that change. All that he said about Mahomet, Islamism, and the Koran to the great men of the country he laughed at himself. He enjoyed the gratification of having all his fine sayings on the subject of religion translated into Arabic poetry, and repeated from mouth to mouth. This of course tended to conciliate the people.

I confess that Bonaparte frequently conversed with the chiefs of the Mussulman religion on the subject of his conversion; but only for the sake of amusement.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 20.3–20.4.
1. What methods did Napoleon use to help him secure and maintain his power?
2. What do you learn by comparing the various viewpoints about Napoleon’s expedition in Egypt?
20.4 The Arab View

The second is an excerpt from the Chronicle of the invasion, by Al Jabarti, a renowned Arab historian and writer. Included in this excerpt is a French proclamation originally printed in Arabic and posted shortly after the French arrival. Al Jabarti wrote that “in this proclamation were inducements, warnings, all manner of wiliness and stipulations.” His recounting of the aftermath of an Egyptian rebellion and of French efforts to provide entertainment and learning follow.


**FRENCH PROCLAMATION**

Formerly, in the lands of Egypt there were great cities, and wide canals and extensive commerce and nothing ruined all this but the avarice and the tyranny of the Maml-uks.

O ye Q-adis, Shaykhs and Im-ams,* O ye Shurb-a-jiyya and men of circumstance tell your nation that the French are also faithful Muslims, and in confirmation of this they invaded Rome and destroyed there the Papai See, which was always exhorting the Christians to make war with Islam. And then they went to the island of Malta, from where they expelled the Knights, who claimed that God the Exalted required them to fight the Muslims. Furthermore, the French at all times have declared themseves to be the most sincere friends of the Ottoman Sultan and the enemy of his enemies, may God ever perpetuate his empire! And on the contrary the Maml-uks have withheld their obeisance from the Sultan, and have not followed his orders. Indeed they never obeyed anything but their own greed!

Blessing on blessing to the Egyptians who will act in concert with us, without any delay, for their condition shall be rightly adjusted, and their rank raised. Blessing also, upon those who will abide in their habitations, not siding with either of the two hostile parties, yet when they know us better, they will hasten to us with all their hearts. But woe upon woe to those who will unite with the Mam-l-uks and assist them in the war against us, for they will not find the way of escape, and no trace of them shall remain.

Written in the Camp at Alexandria on the 13th of the month Messidor [the 6th year] of the founding of the French Republic, that is to say toward the end of the month Muharram in the year [1213] of the Hijra [2 July 1798].

* Muslim religious judges, teachers, and leaders.
gloat in the misfortune of the vanquished, rabid hyenas, mongrels obdurate in their nature. On that night the Lord’s host allowed the host of Satan to move freely, because of a pledge which He had taken upon Himself, fulfilling it beyond all requirements.

Formerly the French would pass through this area only rarely and venerated it as others did both outwardly and in their hearts. However, after the rebellion the whole nature of things changed, the high becoming low in an illogical way. Then the French roved in the market-places, forming ranks, and in the streets gathered in hundreds and thousands. Whenever anyone passed them they would search him, taking everything in his possession. Sometimes they even killed him.

the French ordered the remainder of those living by the Birkat al-Azbakiyya and its surroundings to pack and move from their houses so that their (the French) compatriots who were scattered about would come together and live in one single quarter. This was as a result of the fear of the Muslims which had gripped them and to such an extent that no Frenchman would go unarmed. He who had no arms would take a stick or a whip or the like. This happened after they had already felt safe with the Muslims and had ceased to bear arms at all and had played and joked with them.

after this incident (rebellion) occurred both sects felt mutually repelled and each was on his guard toward the other.

they (the French) constructed some buildings with compartments and places for amusement and licentiousness including all kinds of depravities and unrestricted entertainment, among them drinks and spirits, female singers and European dancers and the like. One of their notables was in charge of it. On the day of its opening he held a banquet to which he invited the notables of the French and some of those of the Muslims and the Shaykhs.

To the administrators of affairs (managers), the astronomers, scholars, and scientists in mathematics, geometry, astronomy, engraving and drawing, and also to the painters, scribes, and writers they assigned al-N-asiriyya quarter and all the houses in it,

The administrators, astronomers, and some of the physicians lived in houses in which they placed a great number of their books and with a keeper taking care of them and arranging them. And the students among them would gather two hours before noon every day in an open space opposite the shelves of books, sitting on chairs arranged in parallel rows before a wide long board. Whoever wishes to look up something in a book asks for whatever volumes he wants and the librarian brings them to him. Then he thumbs through the pages, looking through the book, and writes. All the while they are quiet and no one disturbs his neighbour. When some Muslims would come to look around they would not prevent them from entering. Indeed they would bring them all kinds of printed books.

I have gone to them many times and they have shown me all these various things and among the things I saw there was a large book containing the Biography of the Prophet, upon whom be mercy and peace. In this volume they draw his noble picture according to the extent of their knowledge and judgement about him. He is depicted standing upon his feet looking toward Heaven as if menacing all creation. In his right hand is the sword and in his left the Book and around him are his Companions, may God be pleased with them, also with swords in their hands.

[Describes other religious pictures.]

[There are] pictures of the countries, the coasts, the seas, the Pyramids, the ancient temples of Upper Egypt.

Also there are pictures of the species of animals, birds, plants and herbage which are peculiar to each land. The glorious Qur’-an is translated into their language! Also many other Islamic books.
I saw some of them who know chapters of the Qur’an by heart. They have a great interest in the sciences, mainly in mathematics and the knowledge of languages, and make great efforts to learn the Arabic language and the colloquial. In this they strive day and night. And they have books especially devoted to all types of languages, their declensions and conjugations as well as their etymologies. They possess extraordinary astronomical instruments of perfect construction and instruments for measuring altitudes / of wondrous, amazing, and precious construction. And they have telescopes for looking at the stars and measuring their scopes, sizes, heights, conjunctions, and oppositions, and the clepsydras and clocks with gradings and minutes and seconds, all of wondrous form and very precious, and the like.

[other houses they assigned] to the studious and knowledgeable ones. They called this al-Mad-aris (the Schools) and provided it with funds and copious allowances and generous provisions of food and drink. They

built in it neat and well-designed stoves and ovens, and instruments for distilling, vaporizing, and extracting liquids and ointments belonging to medicine and sublimated simple salts, the salts extracted from burnt herbs, and so forth. In this place there are wondrous retorts of copper for distillation, and vessels and long-necked bottles made of glass of various forms and shapes, by means of which acidic liquids and solvents are extracted. All this is carried out with perfect skill and wondrous invention and the like.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 20.3–20.4.
1. What methods did Napoleon use to help him secure and maintain his power?
2. What do you learn by comparing the various viewpoints about Napoleon’s expedition in Egypt?
20.5 Jean-Jacques Rousseau: from *Emile*

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778) believed that humanity was basically good and that human beings had been corrupted by society. His solution was a call for the creation of a society that mirrored human nature, rather than perverting it. In this selection from *Emile*, Rousseau sketched out his basic principles of sound education.


Remembering that before daring to undertake the formation of a man, one must have made oneself a man. One must find within oneself the example the pupil ought to take for his own. While the child is still without knowledge, there is time to prepare everything that comes near him in order that only objects suitable for him to see meet his first glances. Make your self respectable to everyone. Begin by making yourself loved so that each will seek to please you. You will not be the child’s master if you are not the master of all that surrounds him; and this authority will never be sufficient if it is not founded on the esteem for virtue. It is not a question of emptying one’s purse and spending money by the handful. I have never seen that money has made anyone loved. One ought not to be miserly and hard nor merely pity the poverty that one can relieve. But you can open your coffers all you want; if you do not also open your hearts, others’ hearts will always remain closed to you. It is your time, your care, your affection, it is you yourself that must be given. For no matter what you do, people never feel that your money is you. There are tokens of interest and benevolence which produce a greater effect and are really more useful than any gifts. How many unfortunate people, how many sick people need consolation more than alms! How many oppressed people need protection more than money! Reconcile people who have quarreled; forestall litigations; bring children to their duty, fathers to indulgence; encourage happy marriages; prevent harassment; use, lavish the influence of your pupil’s parents in favor of the weak man to whom justice is denied and who is crushed by the powerful man. Loudly proclaim yourself the protector of the unfortunate. Be just, human, and beneficent. Give not only alms, give charity. Works of mercy relieve more ills than does money. Love others, and they will love you. Serve them, and they will serve you. Be their brother, and they will be your children.

This is again one of the reasons why I want to raise Emile in the country far from the rabble of valets—who are, after their masters, the lowest of men—far from the black morals of cities which are covered with a veneer seductive and contagious for children, unlike peasants’ vices which unadorned and in all their coarseness, are more fit to repel than to seduce when their is no advantage in imitating them.

In a village a governor will be much more the master of the objects he wants to present a child. His reputation, his speeches, and his example will have an authority which they could not have in the city. Since he is useful to everyone, all will be eager to oblige him, to be esteemed by him, to show themselves to disciple as the master would want them to really be. And if they do not actually reform, they will at least abstain from scandal; this is all we need for our project.

Stop blaming others for your own faults; the evil children see corrupts them less than that which you teach them. Always sermonizers, always moralists, always pedants, for one idea you give them. Believing it to be good, you give them at the same time twenty that are worthless. Full of what is going on in your head, you do not see the effect you are producing in theirs. In this long stream of words with which you constantly exasperate them, do you think there is not one which they misapprehend? Do you think that they do not make their own commentaries on your diffuse explanations, and that they do not find in these explanations the material for setting up a system on their own level, which they will know how to use against you when the occasion demands?

Listen to a little fellow who has just been indoctrinated. Let him chatter, question, utter foolishness at his ease, and you are going to be surprised at the strange turn your reasonings have taken in his mind. He mixes up everything, turns everything upside down; he makes you lose your patience, sometimes grieves you by unforeseen objections. He reduces you to silence or to silencing him, and what can he think of this silence on the part of a man who likes to talk so much? If ever he gains this advantage and notices it, farewell to education. Everything is finished from this moment: he no longer seeks to learn; he seeks to refute you.

Zealous masters, be simple, discreet, restrained; never hasten to act except to prevent others from acting. I shall repeat it endlessly: put off, if possible, a good lesson for fear of giving a bad one. On this earth, out of which nature has made man’s first paradise, dread exercising the tempter’s function in wanting to give innocence the knowledge of good and evil. Unable to prevent the child’s learning from examples out of doors, limit your vigilance to impressing these examples upon his mind accompanied by the images suitable for him.

Impetuous passions produce a great effect on the child who is witness to them because their manifestations are such as to strike his senses and force him to pay attention. Anger, in particular, is so noisy in its transport that one cannot fail to notice it if one is within its range. It need not be asked whether this is the occasion for a pedagogue to start out on
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a fine speech. Now, no fine speeches! Nothing at all; not a single word. Let the child come; surprised at the spectacle, he will not fail to question you. The response is simple; it is drawn from the very objects which strike his senses. He sees an inflamed face, glittering eyes, threatening gestures; he hears shouts—all signs that the body is out of kilter. Tell him calmly, "This poor man is sick; he is in a fit of fever." On this basis you can find occasions to give him, but in a few words, an idea of illness and their effects, for that, too, belongs to nature and is one of the bonds of necessity to which he should not feel himself subjected.

Is it possible that from this idea, which is not false, he will not early on contract a certain repugnance to abandoning himself to the excesses of the passions, which he will regard as disease? And do you believe that some such notion, given apropos, will not produce an effect as salutary as the most boring moral sermon? Moreover, just consider the future ramifications of this nation! Now you are authorized, if you are ever forced to do so, to treat a rebellious child as a sick child, to shut him up in his room, in his bed if necessary, to keep him on a diet, to frighten him with his own nascent vices, to render them odious and redoubtable to him, without his ever being able to regard as a chastisement the severity you will perhaps be forced to use to cure him of them. If it should happen that you yourself, in a moment of heat, lose that coolness and moderation which you should make your own study, do not seek to disguise your mistake before him, but tell him frankly with a tender reproach, "my friend, you hurt me."

Furthermore, it is important that none of a child’s naïve statements—the products of the simplicity of the ideas on which he feeds—ever be picked up in his presence or quoted in such a way that he can learn of it. An indiscreet outburst of laughter can ruin the work of six months and do irreparable harm for the whole of life. I cannot repeat often enough that to be the child’s master one must be one’s own master. I see my little Emile, at the height of a fracas between two neighbors, approaching the more furious of the two and saying to her in a tone of commiseration, “My good woman, you are sick. I am so sorry about it.” This sally will surely not remain without effect on the spectators or perhaps on the actresses. Without laughing, without scolding him, without praising him, I take him away willingly or forcibly before he can see this effect, or at least before he thinks about it, and I hasten to distract him with other objects which make him forget it right away.

It is my design not to enter into all the details but only to expound the general maxims and to give examples for difficult occasions. I hold it to be impossible to bring a child along to the age of twelve in the bosom of society without giving him some idea of the relations of man to man and of the morality of human actions. It is enough if one takes pains to ensure that these notions become necessary to him as late as possible and, when their presentation is unavoidable, to limit them to immediate utility, with the sole intention of preventing him from believing himself master of everything and from doing harm to others without scruple and without knowing it. There are gentle and quiet characters whom one can take a long way in their first innocence without danger. But there are also violent natures whose ferocity develops early and whom one must hasten to make into men so as not to be obliged to put them in chains.

Our first duties are to ourselves; our primary sentiments are centered on ourselves; all our natural movements relate in the first instance to our preservation and our well-being. Thus, the first sentiment of justice does not come to us from the justice we owe but from that which is owed us; and it is again one of the mistakes of ordinary education that, speaking at first to children of their duties, never of their rights, one begins by telling them the opposite of what is necessary, what they cannot understand, and what cannot interest them.

If, therefore, I had to guide one of those children I just mentioned, I would say to myself, “A child does not attack persons but things; and soon he learns by experience to respect whoever surpasses him in age and strength. But things do not defend themselves. The first idea which must be given him is therefore less that of liberty than that of property; and for him to be able to have this idea, he must have something that belongs to him. To mention to him his clothing, his furniture, his toys is to say nothing to him, since, although he disposes of these things, he knows neither why nor how he came by them. To say to him that he has them because they were given to him is hardly to do better, for, in order to give, one must have. Here is, therefore, a property anterior to his, and it is the principle of property one wants to explain to him, not to mention that a gift is a convention and that the child cannot know yet what convention is.”† Readers, in this example and in a hundred thousand others, I beg you to note how we stuff children’s heads with words which have no meaning within their reach and then believe we have instructed them very well.

---

* One ought never to permit a child to play withgrownups as with his inferiors or even as with his equals. If he seriously dares to strike someone, be it his lackey, be it the hangman, arrange that his blows be always returned with interest and in such a way as to destroy the desire to revert to the practice. I have seen imprudent governesses animate the unruliness of a child, incite him to strike, let themselves be struck and laugh at his feeble blows, without thinking that in the intention of the little enraged one these blows were so many murders and that he who wants to strike when young will want to kill when grown.

† This is why most children want to have back what they have given and cry when one does not want to return it to them. This no longer occurs when they have gotten a good conception of what a gift is, but then they are more circumspect about giving.
The thing to do therefore is to go back to the origin of property, for it is there that the first idea of it ought to be born. The child, living in the country, will have gotten some notion of labor in the fields. For this only eyes and leisure are necessary; he will have both. It belongs to every age, especially his, to want to create, imitate, produce, give signs of power and activity. It will not take two experiences of seeing a garden plowed, sowed, sprouting, and growing vegetables for him to want to garden in his turn.

According to the principles previously established, I in no way oppose his desire. On the contrary, I encourage it. I share his taste. I work with him, not for his pleasure, but for mine; at least he believes it to be so. I become his gardener's helper. Until he has arms I plow the earth for him. He takes possession of it by planting a bean in it. And surely this possession is more sacred and more respectable than that taken of South America when Núñez Balboa in the name of the King of Spain planted his standard on the shore of the South Sea.

**Question:**
1. What are the virtues of the teacher for Rousseau?
20.6 Samuel Taylor Coleridge: From Aids to Reflection

Close friends with William Wordsworth (1770–1850), Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834) was a seminal figure in the romantic movement. Coleridge and Wordsworth jointly published Lyrical Ballads (1798), one of the most important works of the movement. In the excerpt included here, Coleridge distinguished between reason and understanding.


On the contrary, Reason is the power of universal and necessary convictions, the source and substance of truths above sense, and having their evidence in themselves. Its presence is always marked by the necessity of the position affirmed: this necessity being conditional, when a truth of reason is applied to facts of experience, or to the rules and maxims of the understanding; but absolute, when the subject matter is itself the growth or offspring of reason. Hence arises a distinction in reason itself, derived from the different mode of applying it, and from the objects to which it is directed: accordingly as we consider one and the same gift, now as the ground of formal principles, and now as the origin of ideas. Contemplated distinctively in reference to formal (or abstract) truth, it is the Speculative Reason; but in reference to actual (or moral) truth, as the fountain of ideas and the light of the conscience, we name it the Practical Reason. Whenever by self-subjection to this universal light, the will of the individual, the particular will, has become a will of reason, the man is regenerate: and reason is then the spirit of the regenerated man, whereby the person is capable of a quickening intercommunion with the Divine Spirit. And herein consists the mystery of Redemption, that this has been rendered possible for us. And so it is written; the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening Spirit. (1 Cor. xv. 45.) We need only compare the passages in the writings of the Apostles Paul and John, concerning the Spirit and spiritual gifts, with those in the Proverbs and in the Wisdom of Solomon Respecting Reason, to be convinced that the terms are synonymous. In this at once most comprehensive and most appropriate acceptation of the word, Reason is pre-eminently spiritual, and a spirit, even our spirit, through an effluence of the same grace by which we are privileged to say, Our Father!

On the other hand, the judgments of the Understanding are binding only in relation to the objects of our senses, which we reflect under the forms of the understanding. It is, as Leighton rightly defines it, “the faculty judging according to sense.” Hence we add the epithet human without tautology: and speak of the human understanding in disjunction from that of beings higher or lower than man. But there is, in this sense, no human reason. There neither is nor can be but one reason, one and the same; even the light that lighteth every man’s individual understanding (discursus), and thus maketh it a reasonable understanding, discourse of reason—one only, yet manifold: it goeth through all understanding, and remaining in itself regenerateth all other powers. The same writer calls it likewise an influence from the Glory of the Almighty, this being one of the names of the Messiah, as the Logos, or co-eternal Filial Word. And most noticeable for its coincidence is a fragment of Heraclitus, as I have indeed already noticed elsewhere;—“To discourse rationally it behoves us to derive strength from that which is common to all men: for all human understandings are nourished by the one Divine Word.”

Beasts, I have said, partake of understanding. If any man deny this, there is a ready way of settling the question. Let him give a careful perusal to Hübcr’s two small volumes on bees and ants (especially the latter), and to Kirby and Spence’s Introduction to Entomology; and one or other of two things must follow. He will either change his opinion as irreconcilable with the facts; or he must deny the facts; which yet I can not suppose, inasmuch as the denial would be tantamount to the no less extravagant than uncharitable assertion, that Hübcr, and the several eminent naturalists, French and English, Swiss, German, and Italian, by whom Hübcr’s observations and experiments have been repeated and confirmed, have all conspired to impose a series of falsehoods and fairy-tales on the world. I see no way, at least, by which he can get out of this dilemma, but by over-leaping the admitted rules and fences of all legitimate discussion, and either transferring to the world, Understanding, the definition already appropriate to Reason, or defining understanding in genere by the specific and accessional perfections which the human understanding derives from its co-existence with reason and free-will in the same individual person; in plainer words, from its being exercised by a self-conscious and responsible creature. And, after all, the supporter of Harrington’s position would have a right to ask him, by what other name he would designate the faculty in the instances referred to? If it be not understanding what is it?

In no former part of this Volume have I felt the same anxiety to obtain a patient attention. For I do not hesitate to avow, that on my success in establishing the validity and importance of the distinction between Reason and the Understanding, rest my hopes of carrying the Reader along with me through all that is to follow. Let the student but clearly see and comprehend the diversity in the things themselves, and the expediency of a correspondent distinction and appropriation of the words will follow of itself. Turn back for a moment to the Aphorism, and having re-perused the first paragraph of this Comment thereon, regard the two following narratives as the illustration. I do not say proof: for I take these from a multitude of facts equally striking for the one only purpose of placing my meaning out of all doubt.
I. Hüber put a dozen bumble-bees under a bell-glass along with a comb of about ten silken cocoons so unequal in height as not to be capable of standing steady. To remedy this two or three of the bumblebees got upon the comb, stretched themselves over its edge, and with their heads downwards fixed their forefeet on the table on which the comb stood, and so with their hind feet kept the comb from falling. When these were weary others took their places. In this constrained and painful posture, fresh bees relieving their comrades at intervals, and each working in its turn, did these affectionate little insects support the comb for nearly three days: at the end of which they had prepared sufficient wax to build pillars with. But these pillars having accidentally got displaced, the bees had recourse again to the same maneuver, till Hüber pitying their hard case, &c.

II. “I shall at present describe the operations of a single ant that I observed sufficiently long to satisfy my curiosity.

“One rainy day I observed a laborer digging the ground near the aperture which gave entrance to the ant-hill. It placed in a heap the several fragments it had scraped up, and formed them into small pellets, which it deposited here and there upon the nest. It returned constantly to the same place, and appeared to have a marked design, for it labored with ardor and perseverance. I remarked a slight furrow, excavated in the ground in a straight line, representing the plan of a path or gallery. The laborer, the whole of whose movements fell under my immediate observation, gave it greater depth and breadth, and cleared out its borders: and I saw at length, in which I could not be deceived, that it had the intention of establishing an avenue which was to lead from one of the stories to the underground chambers. This path, which was about two or three inches in length, and formed by a single ant, was opened above and bordered on each side by a buttress of earth; its concavity en forme de goutière was of the most perfect regularity, for the architect had not left an atom too much. The work of this ant was so well followed and understood, that I could almost to a certainty guess its next proceeding, and the very fragment it was about to remove. At the side of the opening where this path terminated, was a second opening to which it was necessary to arrive by some road. The same ant engaged in and executed alone this understanding. It furrowed out and opened another path, parallel to the first, leaving between each a little wall of three or four lines in height. Those ants who lay the foundation of a wall, chamber, or gallery, from working separately occasion, now and then, a want of coincidence in the parts of the same or different objects. Such examples are of no unfrequent occurrence, but they by no means embarrass them. What follows proves that the workman, on discovering his error, knew how to rectify it. A wall had been erected with the view of sustaining a vaulted ceiling, still incomplete, that had been projected from the wall of the opposite chamber. The workman who began constructing it, had given it too little elevation to meet the opposite partition upon which it was to rest. Had it been continued on the original plan, it must infallibly have met the wall at about one half of its height, and this it was necessary to avoid. This state of things very forcibly claimed my attention, when one of the ants arriving at the place, and visiting the works, appeared to be struck by the difficulty which presented itself; but this it as soon obviated, by taking down the ceiling and raising the wall upon which it reposed. It then, in my presence, constructed a new ceiling with the fragments of the former one.”—Hüber’s Natural History Ants, pp. 38–41.

Now I assert, that the faculty manifested in the acts here rated does not differ in kind from understanding, and that it does so differ from reason. What I conceive the former to be, physiologically considered, will be shown hereafter. In this place I take the understanding as it exists in men, and in exclusive reference to its intellectual functions; and it is in this sense of the word that I am to prove the necessity of contra-distinguishing it from reason.

Premising then, that two or more subjects having the same essential characters are said to fall under the same general definition, I lay it down, as a self-evident truth—(it is, in fact, an identical proposition)—that whatever subjects fall under one and the same general definition are of one and the same kind: consequently, that which does not fall under this definition, must differ in kind from each and all of those that do. Difference in degree does indeed suppose sameness in kind; and difference in kind precludes distinction from difference of degree. Heterogenea non comparari, ergo nec distingui, possunt. The inattention to this rule gives rise to the numerous sophisms comprised by Aristotle under the head of μεταβατικος εις αλλο γενος, that is, transition into a new kind, or the falsely applying to X what had been truly asserted of A, and might have been true of X, had it differed from A in its degree only. The sophistry consists in the omission to notice what not being noticed will be supposed not to exist; and where the silence respecting the difference in kind its tantamount to an assertion that the difference is merely in degree. But the fraud is especially gross, where the heterogeneous subject, thus clandestinely split in, is in its own nature insusceptible of degree: such as, for instance, certainty or circularity, contrasted with strength, or magnitude.

To apply these remarks for our present purpose, we have only to describe Understanding and Reason, each by its characteristic qualities. The comparison will show the difference.

**UNDERSTANDING**

1. Understanding is discursive.
2. The Understanding in all its judgments refers to some other faculty as its ultimate authority.
3. Understanding is the faculty of reflection.
**Reason**

1. Reason is fixed.
2. The Reason in all its decisions appeals to itself as the ground and substance of their truth. *(Heb, vi. 13.)*
3. Reason of contemplation. Reason indeed is much nearer to Sense than to Understanding: for Reason (says our great Hooker) is a direct aspect of truth, an inward beholding, having a similar relation to the intelligible or spiritual, as Sense has to the material or phenomenal.

The result is, that neither falls under the definition of the other. They differ in kind: and had my object been confined to the establishment of this fact, the preceding columns would have superseded all further disquisition. But I have ever in view the especial interest of my youthful readers, whose reflective power is to be cultivated, as well as their particular reflections to be called forth and guided. Now the main chance of their reflecting on religious subjects aight, and of their attaining to the contemplation of spiritual truths at all, rests on their insight into the nature of this disparity still more than on their conviction of its existence. I now, therefore, proceed to a brief analysis of the Understanding, in elucidation of the definitions already given.

The Understanding then, considered exclusively as an organ of human intelligence, is the faculty by which we reflect and generalize. Take, for instance, any object consisting of many parts, a house, or a group of houses: and if it be contemplated, as a whole, that is, as many constituting a one, it forms what, in the technical language of psychology, is called a total impression. Among the various component parts of this, we direct our attention especially to such as we recollect to have noticed in other total impressions. Then, by a voluntary act, we withhold our attention from all the rest to be called forth and guided. Now the main chance of their reflecting on religious subjects aright, and of their possessing a previous impression on the senses: first, the appropriation of our attention; second (and in order to the continuance of the first) abstraction, or the voluntary withholding of the attention; and, third, generalization. And these are the proper functions of the Understanding; and the power of so doing, is what we mean, when we say we possess understanding, or are created with the faculty of understanding.²

---

¹ Accordingly as we attend more or less to the differences, the sort becomes, of course, more or less comprehensive. Hence there arises for the systematic naturalist the necessity of subdividing the sorts into orders, classes, families, &c.: all which, however, resolve themselves for the mere logician into the conception of genus and species, that the comprehending and the comprehended.

² It is obvious, that the third function includes the act of comparing one object with another. The act of comparing supposes in the comparing faculty certain inherent forms, that is, modes of reflecting not referable to the objects reflected on, but pre-determined by the constitution and mechanism of the understanding itself. And under some one or other of these forms, the resemblances and differences must be subsumed in order to be conceivable, and à fortiori therefore in order to be comparable. The senses do not compare, but merely furnish the materials for comparison.

Were it not so, how could the first comparison have been possible? It would involve the absurdity of measuring a thing by itself. But if we think on some one thing, the length or our own foot, or of our hand and arm from the elbow-joint, it is evident that in order to do this, we must have the conception of measure. Now these antecedent and most general conceptions are what is meant by the constituent forms of the understanding: we call them constituent because they are not acquired by the understanding, but are implied in its constitution. As rationally might a circle be said to acquire a centre and circumference, as the Understanding to acquire these its inherent forms or ways of conceiving. This is what Leibnitz meant, when to the old adage of the Peripatetics, *Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*—there is nothing in the understanding not derived from the senses, or—there is nothing conceived that was not previously perceived,—he replied—*praeter intellectum ipsum, except the understanding itself.*

And here let me remark for once and all: whoever would reflect to any purpose—whoever is in earnest in his pursuit of self-knowledge, and of one of the principal means to this, an insight into the meaning of the words he uses, and the different meaning of the words he uses, and the different meanings properly or improperly conveyed by one and the same word, accordingly as it is used in the schools or the market,—accordingly as the kind or a high degree is intended (for example, heat, weight, and the like, as employed scientifically, compared with the same word used popularly) —however, I say, seriously, proposes this as his object, must so far overcome his dislike of pedantry, and his dread of being sneered at as a pedant, as not to quarrel with an uncouth word or phrase, till he is quite sure that some other and more familiar one would not only have expressed the precise meaning with equal clearness, but have been as likely to draw attention to this meaning exclusively. The ordinary language of a philosopher in conversation or popular writings, compared with the language he uses in strict reasoning, is as his watch compared with the chronometer in his observatory. He sets the former by the town clock, or even, perhaps, by the Dutch clock in his kitchen, not because he believes it right, but because his neighbors and his cook go by it. To afford the reader an opportunity for exercising the forbearance here recommended, I turn back to the phrase, “most general conceptions,” and observe, that in strict and severe propriety of language, I should have said *generalis, or generific rather than general, and concipiences or conceptive acts rather than conceptions.*

It is an old complaint, that a man of genius no sooner appears, but the host of dunces are up in arms to repel the invading alien. This observation would have made more converts to its truth, I suspect, had it been worded more dispassionately and with a less contemptuous antithesis. For “dunces,” let us substitute “the many,” or the *ὅσος·κοσμός* (this world) of the Apostle, and we shall perhaps find no great difficulty in accounting for the fact. To arrive at the root, indeed, and last ground of the problem, it would be necessary to investigate the nature and effects of the sense of difference on the human mind where it is not held in check by reason and reflection. We need not go to the savage tribes of North America, or the yet ruder natives of the Indian Isles, to learn how slight a degree of difference will, in uncultivated minds, call up a sense of diversity, and inward perplexity and contradiction, as if the strangers were, and yet were not, of the same kind with themselves. Who has not had occasion to observe the effect which the gesticulations and nasal tones of a Frenchman produce on our own vulgar? Here we may see the origin and primary import of our *unkindness*. It is a sense of unkind, and not the mere negation but the positive opposite of the sense of kind. Alienation, aggravated now by fear, now by contempt, and not seldom by a mixture of both, aversion, hatred, enmity, are so many successive shapes of its growth and *metamorphosis*. In application to the present case, it is sufficient to say, that Pindar’s remark on sweet music holds equally true of genius: as many are not delighted by it are disturbed, perplexed, irritated. The holder either recognizes it as a projected form of his own being, that moves before
Now when a person speaking to us of any particular object or appearance refers it by means of some common character to a known class (which he does in giving it a name), we say, that we understand him; that is, we understand his words. The name of a thing, in the original sense of the word name (nomen, νομίμων, τὸ intelligible, id quod intelligitur), expresses that which is understood in an appearance, that which we place (or make to stand) under it, as the condition of its real existence, and in proof that it is not an accident of the senses, or affection of the individual, not a phantom or apparition, that is, an appearance which is only an appearance. (See Gen. ii. 19, 20, and in Psalm xx. 1, and in many other places of the Bible, the identity of nomen with numen, that is, invisible power and presence, the nomen substantivum of all real objects and the ground of their reality, independently of the affections of sense in the percipient). In like manner, in a connected succession of names, as the speaker passes from one to the other, we say that we understand his discourse, discursus intellectus, discursus, his passing from one thing to another. Thus, in all instances, it is words, names, or, if images, yet images used as words or names, that are the only and exclusive subjects of understanding, in no instance do we understand a thing in itself; but only the name to which it is referred. Sometimes indeed, when several classes are recalled conjointly, we identify the words with the object—though by courtesy of idiom rather than in strict propriety of language. Thus we may say that we understand a rainbow, when recalling successively the several names for the several sorts of colors, we know that they are to be applied to one and the same phaenomenon, at once distinctly and simultaneously; but even in common speech we should not say this of a single color. No one would say he understands red or blue. He sees the color, and had seen it before in a vast number and variety of objects; and he understand the word red, as referring his fancy or memory to this his collective experience.

If this be so, and so it most assuredly is—if the proper functions of the understanding be that of generalizing the notices received from the senses in order to the Construction of names referring particular notices, that is, impressions or sensations, to their proper names; and, vice versa, names to their correspondent class or kind of notices—then it follows of necessity, that the Understanding is truly and accurately defined in the words of Leighton and Kant, a faculty judging according to sense.

(continued) him with a glory round its head, or recoils from it as from a spectre. But this speculation would lead me too far; I must be content with having referred to it as the ultimate ground of the fact, and pass to the more obvious and proximate causes. And as the first, I would rank the person’s not understanding what yet be expects to understand, and as if he had a right to do so. An original mathematical work, or any other that requires peculiar and technical marks and symbols, will excite no uneasy feelings—not in the mind of a competent reader, for he understands it; and not with others, because they neither expect nor are expected to understand it. The second place we may assign to the misunderstanding, which is almost sure to follow in cases where the incompetent person, finding no outward marks (diagrams, arbitrary signs, and the like) to inform him at first sight, that the subject is one which he does not pretend to understand, and to be ignorant of which does not detract from his estimation as a man of abilities generally, will attach some meaning to what he hears or reads; and as he is out of humor with the author, it will most often be such a meaning as he can quarrel with and exhibit in a ridiculous or offensive point of view.

But above all, the whole world almost of minds, as far as we regard intellectual efforts, may be divided into two classes of the busy-indolent and lazy-indolent. To both alike all thinking is painful, and all attempts to rouse them to think, whether in the re-examination of their existing convictions, or for the reception of new light, are irritating. “It may all be very deep and clever; but really one ought to be quite sure of it before one wrenches one’s brain to find out what it is. I take up a book as a companion, with whom I can have an easy cheerful chit-chat on what we both know beforehand, or else matters of fact. In our leisure hours we have a right to relaxation and amusement.”

Well! but in their studious hours, when their bow is to be bent, when they are apud Musas, or amidst the Muses? Alas! it is just the same. The same craving for amusement, that is, to be away from the Muses; for relaxation, that is, the unbending of a bow which in fact had never been strung? There are two ways of obtaining their applause. The first is: enable them to reconcile in one and the same occupation the love of sloth and the hatred of vacancy. Gratify indolence, and yet save them from ennui—in plain English, from themselves. For, spite of their antipathy to dry reading, the keeping company with themselves is, after all, the insufferable annoyance; and the true secret of their dislike to a work of thought and inquiry lies in its tendency to make them acquainted with their own permanent being. The other road to their favor is, to introduce to them their own thoughts and predilections, tricked out in the fine language, in which it would gratify their vanity to express them in their own conversation, and with which they can imagine themselves showing off: and this (as has been elsewhere remarked) is the characteristic difference between the second-rate writers of the last two or three generations, and the same class under Elizabeth and the Stuarts. In the latter we find the most far-fetched and singular thoughts in the simplest and most native language; in the former, and the most obvious and commonplace thoughts in the most far-fetched and motley language. But lastly, and as the sine qua non of their patronage, a sufficient arc must be left for the reader’s mind to oscillate in—for freedom of choice.

To make the shifting cloud be what you please, save only where the attraction of curiosity determines the line of motion. The attention must not be fastened down: and this every work of genius, not simply narrative, must do before it can be justly appreciated.

In former times a popular work meant one that adapted the results of studious meditation or scientific research to the capacity of the people, presenting in the concrete, by instances and examples, what had been ascertained in the abstract and by discovery of the law. Now, on the other hand, that is a popular work which gives back to the people their own errors and prejudices, and flatters the many by creating them under the title of the public, into a supreme and inappellable tribunal of intellectual excellence.

P.S. In a continuous work, the frequent insertion and length of notes would need an apology: in a book like this, of aphorisms and detached comments, none is necessary, it being understood beforehand that the sauce and the garnish are to occupy the greater part of the dish.
Now whether in defining the speculative Reason,—(that is, the reason considered abstractedly as an intellective power)—we call it “the source of necessary and universal principles, according to which the notices of the senses are either affirmed or denied;” or describe it as “the power by which we are enabled to draw from particular and contingent appearances universal and necessary conclusions;” it is equally evident that the two definitions differ in their essential characters, and consequently the subjects differ in kind.

3 Take a familiar illustration. My sight and touch convey to me a certain impression, to which my understanding applies its pre-conceptions inexpressible. Examples: Before Abraham was, I am.—God is a circle the centre of which is everywhere, and circumference nowhere. The soul is all in all every part.

If this appear extravagant, it is an extravagance which no man can indeed learn from another, but which, (were this possible,) I might have learnt from Plato, Kepler, and Bacon; from Luther, Hooker, Pascal, Leibnitz, and Fénelon. But in this last paragraph I have, I see unwittingly overstepped my purpose, according to which we were to take reason as a simply intellectual power. Yet even as such, and withall the disadvantage of a technical and arbitrary abstraction, it had been made evident:—1. that there is an intuition or immediate beholding, accompanied by a conviction of the necessity and universality of the truth so beheld, of the senses, which intuition, when it is construed by pre sense, gives birth to the science of mathematics, and when applied to objects supersensuous or spiritual is the organ of theology and philosophy—and 2. that there is likewise a reflective and discursive faculty, or mediate apprehension which, taken by itself and uninfluenced by the former, depends on the senses for the materials on which it is exercised, and is contained within the sphere of the senses. And this faculty it is, which in generalizing the notices of the senses constitutes sensible experience, and gives rise to maxims or rulers which may become more and more general, but can never be raised into universal verities, or beget a consciousness of absolute certainty; though they may be sufficient to extinguish all doubt. (Putting revelation out of view, take our first progenitor in the 50th or 100th year of his existence. His experience would probably have freed him from all doubt, as the sun sank in the horizon, that it would re-appear the next morning. But compare this state of assurance with that which the same man would have had of the 47th proposition of Euclid, supposing him like Pythagoras to have discovered the demonstration.) Now it is expedient, I ask, or conformable to the laws and purposes of language, to call two so altogether disparate subjects by one and the same name? Or, having two names in our language, should we call each of the two diverse subjects by both—that is, by either name, as caprice might dictate? If not, then as we have the two words, reason and understanding (as indeed what language of cultivated man has not?)—what should prevent us from appropriating the former to the power distincity? We need only place the derivatives from the two terms in opposition (for example, “A” and “B” are both names for beings; but there is no comparison between them in point of intelligence,” or “She always concludes rationally, though not a woman of much understanding”) to see that we can not reverse the order—that is, call the higher gift understanding, and the lower reason. What should prevent us? I asked. Alas! that which has prevented us—the cause of this confusion in the terms—is only too obvious; namely, inattention to the momentous distinction in the things, and generally, to the duty and habit recommended in the fifth introductory Aphorism of this Volume. But the cause of this, and of all its lamentable effects and subcauses, false doctrine, blindness of heart, and contempt of the word, is best declared by the philosophic Apostle: they did not like to retain God in their knowledge (Rom. I. 28), and though they could not extinguish the light that lighteth every man, and which shine in the darkness: yet because the darkness could not comprehend the light, they refused to bear witness of it and worshiped, instead, the shaping mist, which the light had drawn upward from the ground (that is, from the mere animal nature and instinct), and which that light alone had made visible, that is, by superinducing on the animal instinct the principle of self-consciousness.(continued from previous page) forms of the understanding, all truth must be reduced, that is to be fixed as an object of reflection, and to be rendered expressible. And here we have a second test and sign of a truth so affirmed, that in its own proper form it is inconceivable. For to conceive is a function of the imagination, there arises a presumption that in all other bodies of the same figure (that is, three-cornered and equilaterial) the same proportion exists. After this, the senses have been directed successively to a number of three-cornered bodies of unequal sides—and in these too the same proportion has been found without exception, till at length it becomes a fact of experience, that in all triangles hitherto seen, the two sides together are greater than the third: and there will exist no ground or analogy for anticipating an exception to a rule, generalized from so vast a number of particular instances. So far and no farther could the understanding carry us: and as far as this “the faculty, judging according to sense,” conducts many of the inferior animals, if not in the same, yet in instances analogous and fully equivalent.

The reason supersedes the whole process, and on the first conception presented by the understanding in consequence of the first sight of a triangular figure, of whatever sort it might chance to be, it affirms with an assurance incapable of future increase, with a perfect certainly, that in all possible triangles any two of the inclosing lines will and must be greater than the third. In short, understanding in its highest form of experience remains commensurate with the experimental notices of the senses from which it is generalized. Reason, on the other hand, either predetermines experience, or avails itself of a past experience to supersed its necessity in all future time; and affirms truths which no sense could perceive, nor experiment verify, nor experience confirm.

Yea, this is the test and character of a truth so affirmed, that in its own proper form it is inconceivable. For to conceive is a function of the imagination, there arises a presumption that in all other bodies of the same figure (that is, three-cornered and equilateral) the same proportion exists. After this, the senses have been directed successively to a number of three-cornered bodies of unequal sides—and in these too the same proportion has been found without exception, till at length it becomes a fact of experience, that in all triangles hitherto seen, the two sides together are greater than the third: and there will exist no ground or analogy for anticipating an exception to a rule, generalized from so vast a number of particular instances. So far and no farther could the understanding carry us: and as far as this “the faculty, judging according to sense,” conducts many of the inferior animals, if not in the same, yet in instances analogous and fully equivalent.

The reason supersedes the whole process, and on the first conception presented by the understanding in consequence of the first sight of a triangular figure, of whatever sort it might chance to be, it affirms with an assurance incapable of future increase, with a perfect certainly, that in all possible triangles any two of the inclosing lines will and must be greater than the third. In short, understanding in its highest form of experience remains commensurate with the experimental notices of the senses from which it is generalized. Reason, on the other hand, either predetermines experience, or avails itself of a past experience to supersed its necessity in all future time; and affirms truths which no sense could perceive, nor experiment verify, nor experience confirm.

The reason supersedes the whole process, and on the first conception presented by the understanding in consequence of the first sight of a triangular figure, of whatever sort it might chance to be, it affirms with an assurance incapable of future increase, with a perfect certainly, that in all possible triangles any two of the inclosing lines will and must be greater than the third. In short, understanding in its highest form of experience remains commensurate with the experimental notices of the senses from which it is generalized. Reason, on the other hand, either predetermines experience, or avails itself of a past experience to supersed its necessity in all future time; and affirms truths which no sense could perceive, nor experiment verify, nor experience confirm.
The dependence of the Understanding on the representations of the senses, and its consequent posteriority thereto, as contrasted with the independence and antecedency of Reason, are strikingly exemplified in the Ptolemaic system—that truly wonderful product and highest boast of the faculty, judging according to the senses—compared with the Newtonian, as the offspring of a yet higher power, arranging, correcting, and annuling the representations of the senses according to its own inherent laws and constitutive ideas.

Question:
1. What is the importance of the distinction between reasoning and understanding?
20.7 Gothic Churches

François René Chateaubriand (1768–1848) played a crucial role in bringing romanticism to French literature. A champion of religion, his work *The Genius of Christianity* brought him to the attention of the French reading public. In the piece included here, Chateaubriand described the power of Gothic churches.

*Source: Beatty and Johnson, *Heritage of Western Civilization, 8th Ed.*

Although “Everything ought to be put in its place” is a trivial truth which carries force by its constant repetition, nevertheless without accepting it one cannot, after all, have anything perfect. The Greeks would not have appreciated an Egyptian temple at Athens any more than the Egyptians would a Greek temple at Memphis. The two buildings in exchanging place would have lost their main beauty, that is to say their relationship with the institutions and practices of the people. We can apply the same reflection to old Christian edifices. It is pertinent to remark that, even in this century of unbelief, poets and novelists, by a natural return to the customs of our ancestors, like to introduce dungeons, ghosts, castles, and Gothic temples into their fictions; so great is the charm of memories linked with religion and the history of our country. Nations do not discard their ancient customs as people do their old clothes. Some part of them may be abandoned but remnants will remain, forming a shocking combination with their new manners.

In vain would you build Gothic temples ever so elegant and well lighted, for the purpose of assembling the good people of St. Louis and making them adore a metaphysical God; they would always miss Notre Dame of Rheims and of Paris, moss-covered cathedrals filled with generations of the dead and the spirits of their forefathers; they would always miss the tombs of the house of Montmorency on which they found comfort in kneeling during mass, to say nothing of the sacred fonts to which they were carried at birth. The reason is that all of these things are inextricably interwoven with our customs; that a monument is not venerable unless a long history of the past is so to speak inscribed beneath its vaulted ceilings, all black with age. For this reason also there is nothing marvelous in a temple we have watched being built, whose echoes and domes were formed before our eyes. God is the eternal law; his origin and everything that is concerned with his worship ought to remain hidden in the night of time.

One cannot enter a Gothic church without experiencing a kind of awe and a vague perception of the Divinity. All at once one finds himself carried back to the time when monks, after having meditated in the woods of their monasteries, met together to prostrate themselves at the altar and chant the praises of the Lord, in the calm and silence of the night. Ancient France seemed to be revived; one believed he saw its strange costumes, its people so different from those of today; one recalled the revolutions of its people, and its accomplishments, and its art. The more remote these times were, the more magical they appeared, the more they inspired thoughts, which always end with a reflection on the nothingness of man and the shortness of life.

The Gothic order, in spite of its barbarous proportions, nevertheless possesses a beauty that belongs to it alone. The forests were the first temples of the Divinity, and men took from the forests their first idea of architecture. This art therefore should vary according to the climate. The Greeks have fashioned the elegant Corinthian column, with its capital of leaves modeled after the palm tree. The enormous pillars of ancient Egypt represent the sycamore, the oriental fig tree, the banana tree, and most of the gigantic trees of Africa and Asia.
The forests of Gaul in their turn have been translated into the temples of our forefathers, and our oak woods have thus maintained their sacred origin. Everything in a Gothic church—its ceilings carved with leaves, the posts supporting its walls and ending suddenly like broken tree trunks, the coolness of its vaults, the darkness of its sanctuary, its dim aisles, its secret passages, its low portals—reminds one of the labyrinths of a wood, everything excites a sense of religious awe, of mystery and of the Divinity. The two lofty towers erected at the entrance to the building rise above the elms and yews of the church-yard and produce a picturesque effect against the blue of the sky. Sometimes dawn illuminates their twin heads; at other times they appear to be crowned with a capital of clouds, or enlarged in an atmosphere of fog. The birds themselves seem to be confused by them, and take them for the trees of the forests; crows hover around their tops and perch on their balconies. But all at once a confused din escapes from the top of the towers and chases the frightened birds away. The Christian architect, not content with building forests, has wished to imitate their murmurs; and, by means of the organ and the bells, he has attached to the Gothic temple the very sound of the winds and the thunder that roar through the depths of the woods. Past epochs, evoked by these religious sounds, raise their venerable voices from the heart of the storms, and sigh through the vast cathedral. The sanctuary moans like the cavern of the ancient Sybil; and, while the bells swing loudly overhead, the vaults of death below remain profoundly silent.

Questions:
1. Why were the Middle Ages so fascinating to the Romantics? What appealed to them about Gothic architecture?
2. How did the Romantics' ideas about nature influence their view of the past?
An acknowledged master in a wide variety of fields, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749 – 1832) was one of the great writers and thinkers of his time. His most famous poem, *Faust*, retold the legend of man's search for power and knowledge. In the poem *Prometheus*, Goethe reflected on the relationship of gods and humans.

**Source:** Beatty and Johnson, *Heritage of Western Civilization*, 8th Ed.

Cover your heavens
In cloud-mists, Zeus,
And like a boy
Beheading thistles, go practice
On oaks and mountain tops!
Still you'll have to
Leave me my earth,
The hut you did not build,
And the hearth,
Whose fire
You envy me.
I know nothing under the sun
Less enviable than you gods!
Your majesty,
Wretchedly nourished
On exacted sacrifice
And breath of prayer,
Would famish were not
Children and beggars
Hopeful fools.
While yet a child,
Knowing no other way,
Lost, I turned my face
To the sun, as if up there
Some ear might hear my lamentation,
Some heart like mine
Pity my affliction.
Who helped me
Resist Titanic arrogance?
Who rescued me from death,
From slavery?
Didn’t you accomplish it yourself,
High impassioned heart?
And yet, youthfully passionate and good
You gave deluded thanks for rescue
To the slumberer above.
Why should I honor you?
Did you ever soothe the pain
Of the oppressed?
Or still the tears
Of anguish, ever?
Wasn’t I forged a man
By everlasting fate
And time omnipotent,
My lords and yours?
Did you suppose
I’d come to hate life,
Escape to deserts,
Because not all
Dreams blossomed?
Here I sit and create men
After my own image,
A race like myself,
To suffer, to weep,
To relish, to rejoice,
And to ignore you,
As do I!

Questions:
1. How did Goethe see the relationship between God and humans?
2. In his view, what role did God play in human accomplishments?
PART 21

Reaction, Reform, and Revolt

21.1 “Sentiments of the Nation”: A Mexican Call for Independence

Mexico began its struggle for independence in 1810, creating an independent government in 1821. Initially led by Miguel Hidalgo, a well-educated parish priest captured and executed in 1811, the struggle was carried on by another parish priest, Jose Maria Morelos, until he was killed in 1815. In 1813, Morelos presented his “Sentiments of the Nation” to a Congress called to plan a new government. The term “sentiments” was a common term of the Enlightenment, which meant not just reason and rationality, but ideas that expressed passion and incorporated religious feelings and social values.


1. That America is free and independent of Spain and every other nation, government, or monarchy, and thus it shall be proclaimed, informing the world why.
2. That the Catholic religion shall be the only one, without tolerance for any other.
3. That the ministers of the Church shall live only from the tithes and first fruits, and the people shall not be required to pay for services, except as true offerings and expressions of their devotion.
4. That the dogma of the religion shall be upheld by the Church hierarchy, consisting of the Pope, the bishops, and the parish priests, because every plant that God did not plant should be weeded out.... Matthew 13.
5. That sovereignty flows directly from the people, and they wish it to be lodged only in the Supremo Congreso Nacional Americano, composed of representatives of the provinces in equal numbers.
6. That the legislative, executive, and judicial powers shall be divided among those bodies that are established to exercise them.
7. That the representatives shall serve for four years in rotation, the old ones leaving office so the newly elected can take their places.
8. The representatives shall be paid a sufficient but not excessive salary. For now, it shall not be more than 8,000 pesos.
9. Government posts shall be held only by Americans.
10. Foreigners shall not be allowed to enter the country unless they are artisans who can instruct others and are free of all suspicion.
11. States alter the customs of the people; therefore, the Fatherland will not be completely free and ours until the government is reformed, replacing the tyrannical with the liberal, and also expelling from our soil the enemy Spaniard who has so greatly opposed our Fatherland.
12. Since the good law is superior to any man, those [laws] that our Congreso issues shall be so, and shall promote constancy and patriotism, and moderate opulence and poverty so that the daily wage of the poor man is raised, his customs improved, and ignorance, preying upon others, and thievery removed.
13. That the general laws shall apply to everyone, including privileged corporations except as applies directly to their duties.
14. To draw up a law, there shall be a gathering of the greatest number of wise men possible, so that the deliberations may proceed with greater certainty. [These men] shall be exempt from some of the duties that might otherwise be demanded of them.
15. Slavery shall be forever forbidden, as shall caste distinctions, leaving everyone equal. One American shall be distinguished from another only by his vices and virtues.
16. That our ports may admit [the ships of] friendly foreign nations, but they cannot be based in the kingdom no matter how friendly they are. And only designated ports—ten percent of those that exist—shall be used for this purpose. Disembarkation in any other is forbidden.
17. The property of every individual shall be protected, and their homes respected as if they were a sacred asylum. Penalties shall be assigned for violators.
18. That the new legislation shall not allow torture.
19. That the new legislation shall establish by constitutional law the celebration of December 12 in every community of the land in honor of Our Most Holy Lady of Guadalupe, patroness of our liberty; and every community is to practice monthly devotions to her.
20. That foreign troops or those from any other [Spanish] kingdom shall not set foot on our soil unless it is to come to our aid, and then only with the authorization of the Suprema Junta.

21. That no expeditions outside the limits of the kingdom shall be made, especially not overseas expeditions; but others not of this kind are to be encouraged in order to propagate the faith among our brothers in the interior [tierradentro, or northern Mexico and the American Southwest].

22. That the plethora of tributes, fees, and taxes that weigh us down shall be eliminated. A five percent charge on grains and other produce, or a similarly light tax, shall be levied on every individual. It shall not oppress us like the alcabala, the tobacco monopoly; the tribute, and others. With this light contribution and good administration of property confiscated from the enemy, the cost of the war and the salaries of employees can be paid.

Chilpancingo, 14 September 1813.

[appended Article] 23. That September 16 also shall be solemnized each year as the anniversary of the beginning of our struggle for Independence and our holy Freedom, for on that date the Nation spoke, demanding its rights with sword in hand so as to be heard. Thus the distinction of the great hero, Señor Don Miguel Hidalgo, and his companion, Don Ignacio Allende, will be remembered forever.

Questions:
1. What is proclaimed or desired in this document?
2. What is the basis for the statement of rights?
3. How are these rights interpreted by the group?
21.2 Thomas MacAulay: A Radical War-Song

The poet, historian, and politician Thomas Babington MacAulay (1800–1859) is best known for his masterpiece, *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second*. Elected to Parliament in 1830, he spent four years in India working on the British vision of a reformed Indian educational and legal system. In the poem included here, MacAulay painted an unsympathetic picture of radical politicians.


Awake, arise, the hour is come,
For rows and revolutions;
There’s no receipt like pike and drum
For crazy constitutions.

Close, close the shop! Break, break the loom!
Desert your hearths and furrows,
And throng in arms to seal the doom
Of England’s rotten boroughs.

We’ll stretch that tort’ing Castlereagh
On his own Dublin rack, sir;
We’ll drown the King in Eau de vie,
The Laureate in his sack, sir;
Old Eldon and his sordid hag
In molten gold we’ll smother,
And stifle in his own green bag
The Doctor and his brother.

In chains we’ll hang in fair Guildhall
The City’s famed Recorder,
And next on proud St. Stephen’s fall,
Though Wynne should squeak to order.
In vain our tyrants then shall try
To ‘scape our marital law, sir;
In vain the trembling Speaker cry
That “Strangers must withdraw,” sir.

Copley to hang offends no text;
A rat is not a man, sir:
With schedules and with tax bills next
We’ll bury pious Van, sir.
The slaves who loved the Income Tax,
We’ll crush by scores, like mites, sir,
And him, the wretch who freed the blacks,
And more enslaved the whites, sir.

The peer shall dangle from his gate,
The bishop from his steeple,
Till all recanting, own, the State
Means nothing but the People.
We’ll fix the church’s revenues
On Apostolic basis,
One coat, one scrip, one pair of shoes
Shall pay their strange grimaces.
We’ll strap the bar’s deluding train
   In their own darling halter,
And with his big church bible brain
   The parsons at the altar.
Hail glorious hour, when fair Reform
   Shall bless our longing nation,
And Hunt receives command to form
   A new administration.

Carlisle shall sit enthroned, where sat
   Our Cranmer, and our Secker;
And Watson show his snow-white hat
   In England’s rich Exchequer.
The breast of Thistlewood shall wear
   Our Wellesley’s star and sash, man;
   And many a mausoleum fair
   Shall rise to honest Cashman.

Then, then beneath the nine-tailed cat
   Shall they who used it writhe, sir;
And curates lean, and rectors fat,
   Shall dig the ground they tithe, sir.
Down with your Bayleys, and your Bests,
   Your Giffords and your Gurneys:
   We’ll clear the island of the pests,
   Which mortals name attorneys.

Down with your sheriffs, and your mayors,
   Your registrars, and proctors,
We’ll live without the lawyer’s cares,
   And die without the doctor’s.
No discontented fair shall pout
   To see her spouse so stupid;
We’ll tread the torch of Hymen out,
   And live content with Cupid.

Then, when the high-born and the great
   Are humbled to our level,
On all the wealth of Church and State.
   Like aldermen, we’ll revel.
We’ll live when hushed the battle’s din,
   In smoking and in cards, sir,
   In drinking unexcised gin,
   And wooing fair Poissardes, sir.

Question:
1. What are MacAulay’s concerns with the radical reform movement?
21.3 Alexis de Tocqueville: The New Social Morality

Alexis de Tocqueville’s (1805–1859) four volume study, *Democracy in America*, was a seminal work in political science. His goal was to identify the lessons Europeans could learn from America as they struggled to achieve liberty and equality in the aftermath of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. In the letter included here, Tocqueville contrasted Christian and “modern” social morality.


Your letter, monsieur, arrived the day I left for the conseil général. I found it upon my return. I want to answer you at once.

I shall ask you now to put all your books aside for a moment and to make a rapid mental survey of your recent readings and of your earlier studies, so as to answer this question in conversational form: What is there really new in the works or in the discoveries of the modern moral philosophers? By modern I mean not merely those of the last fifty years but those who immediately preceded them, those who belong to that generation which had decisively broken with the Middle Ages. Did they really see the obligations of mankind in such a new light? Did they really discover new motives for human actions? Did they really establish new foundations, or even new explanations, for human duties? Have they placed the sanctions of moral laws elsewhere? Through the darkness all I think I can recognize is this: to me it is Christianity that seems to have accomplished the revolution—you may prefer the word change—in all the ideas that concern duties and rights; ideas which, after all, are the basic matter of all moral knowledge.

Christianity did not exactly create new duties or, to put it in other terms, it did not establish entirely new virtues; but it changed their relative position. Certain rude and half-savage virtues had been on the top of the list; Christianity put them on the bottom. The milder virtues, such as neighborly love, pity, leniency, the forgetfulness even of injuries had been on the bottom of the antique list; Christianity placed them above all others. Here was the first change.

The realm of duties had been limited. Christianity broadened it. It had been limited to certain citizenries; Christianity extended it to all men. It had been restricted and confirmed and position of masters; Christianity gave it to the slaves. Thus Christianity put in grand evidence the equality, the unity, the fraternity of all men. Here was the second change.

The sanction of moral laws had existed for this world rather than for the other. Christianity put the ultimate aim of human life beyond this world; it gave thus a finer, purer, less material, less interested, and higher character to morality. Here was the last change.

All of these things had been seen, shown, and preached before it came. But Christianity alone bound them together, making this new morality into a religion, and the minds of men were absorbed therewith.

We have lived with the rule of this morality for a long chain of centuries. Have we added much to it that is essential? This is what I do not see clearly. We may have put a few shades into the colors of the picture, but I do not see that we have added really new colors. The morality of our own time—the way I see it revealed through words and through action and through the ceaseless patter of our loquacious society—our modern morality (and I am leaving aside what is being printed in fat volumes about this subject) may have reverted in some of its facets to the notions of the ancients, yet for the most part it has merely developed and expanded the consequences of Christian morality without affecting the essential principles of the latter. Our society is much more alienated from the theology than it is from the philosophy of Christianity. As our religious beliefs have become less strong and our view of the life hereafter less clear, morality has become more concerned with the legitimacy of material needs and pleasures. This is the idea that I think the followers of Saint-Simon expressed by saying that the flesh must be rehabilitated. It is probably the same tendency that, for some time now, appears in the writings and in the doctrines of our moral philosophers.

For this reason some people have now felt the urge to find the sanctions of moral laws in this life. They could no longer place them with absolute certainty in the life thereafter. From this came the doctrine of benevolent interest, about honesty paying dividends and vice leading to misery. The English Utilitarians are upholders of this new trend of ideas, ideas under unfamiliar to the Christian moralists of the past.

Christianity and consequently its morality went beyond all political powers and nationalities. Its grand achievement is to have formed a human community beyond national societies. The duties of men among themselves as well as in their capacity of citizens, the duties of citizens to their fatherland, in brief, the public virtues seem to me to have been inadequately defined and considerably neglected within the moral system of Christianity. This seems to me the only weak facet of that admirable moral system, just as this seems the only strong facet of the moral system of the antique nations. Though the Christian idea of human brotherhood may seem to dominate contemporary minds, those public virtues have also advanced in the meantime; and I am convinced that the moralists of the past hundred years are preoccupied with it far more than were their predecessors. This is due to the resurgence of political passions. They are, at the same time, causes and
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effects of the great changes we are now witnessing. Thus the modern world re-established a part of antique morality and inserted it within the moral principles of Christianity.

But the most noteworthy innovation of our modern moral teaching, to me, consists in the tremendous development in the new form that is now given to two principles which Christianity had first put in grand evidence: the equal rights of every man in the goods of this world, and the duty of those who have more to help those who have less. The revolutions that displaced the old European ruling class, the general extension of wealth and education which has made individuals more and more alike have given an immense and unexpected impetus to the principle of equality, which Christianity had established in the spiritual rather than in the tangible material sphere. The idea that all men have a right to certain goods, to certain pleasures, and that our primary moral duty is to procure these for them—this idea, as I said above, has now gained immense breadth, and it now appears in an endless variety of aspects. This first innovation led to another. Christianity made charity a personal virtue. Every day now we are making a social duty, a political obligation, a public virtue out of it. And the growing number of those who must be supported, the variety of needs which we are growing accustomed to provide for, the disappearance of great personalities to whom previously one could turn with these problems of succor, now makes every eye turn to the State. Governments now are compelled to redress certain inequalities, to mollify certain hardships, to offer support to all the luckless and helpless. Thus a new kind of social and political morality is being established, a kind which the antique peoples hardly knew but which is, in reality, a combination of some of their political ideas with the moral principles of Christianity.

Here, my dear Gobineau, is all that I can now distinguish through the fog that surrounds me. You see that I speak only of what I see in the habits of people; I am unable to say whether the same signs are registered in books or whether they reappear elsewhere. These reflections of mine are not supposed to give you a foundation or a basic framework, but rather an example of what I think we should search for. We have to find whatever new concepts of morality may exist. I have tried hard, while attempting to keep close to realities. Do my propositions strike you as true? Do you have others to propose? Do these modern moral theories justify them? My own mental habit has made me look exclusively for these newer things which might directly influence the actions of our contemporaries. But I cannot afford to neglect those different moralistic innovations, the new theses, new concepts, new explications which I might be permitted to call sterile fantasies, were it not for my academic affiliation that obliges me to term them “interesting products of the human intellect.”

Only after we shall have outlined whatever there is new in the moral doctrines and tendencies of our age will we begin to follow the consequences of these primary data in some detail. We should ascertain them before all. So, my dear collaborator, put your head in your hands and think about the above. What I ask from you is no longer the work of a student but of a master, yet I am certain that this does not surpass your powers. Once we have this foundation the rest of the work will be easier and at the same time much more interesting. . . .

Farewell, monsieur. Please trust the expression of my very genuine affection.

P.S. Don’t destroy this letter, as I might wish to reread it someday when I finally get down to writing.

Question:
1. How does egalitarianism subvert Christian morals according to de Tocqueville? Is his argument compelling?
21.4 Simon Bolivar’s Political Ideas

Simon Bolivar (1783–1830) played crucial roles in independence movements in modern-day Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. Born to a wealthy family, Bolivar’s progressive education brought him into contact with the writings of Enlightenment figures such as John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau. In the excerpt from his writings included here, Bolivar sketched the political problems facing the Americas as he saw them.


America, in separating from the Spanish monarchy, found herself in a situation similar to that of the Roman Empire when its enormous framework fell to pieces in the midst of the ancient world. Each Roman division then formed an independent nation in keeping with its location or interests; but this situation differed from America’s in that those members proceeded to reestablish their former associations. We, on the contrary, do not even retain the vestiges of our original being. We are not Europeans; we are not Indians; we are but a mixed species of aborigines and Spaniards. Americans by birth and Europeans by law, we find ourselves engaged in a dual conflict: we are disputing with the natives for titles of ownership, and at the same time we are struggling to maintain ourselves in the country that gave us birth against the opposition of the invaders. Thus our position is most extraordinary and complicated. But there is more. As our role has always been strictly passive and our political existence nil, we find that our quest for liberty is now even more difficult of accomplishment: for we, having been placed in a state lower than slavery, had been robbed not only of our freedom but also of the right to exercise an active domestic tyranny. Permit me to explain this paradox.

In absolute systems, the central power is unlimited. The will of the despot is the supreme law, arbitrarily enforced by subordinates who take part in the organized oppression in proportion to the authority that they wield. They are charged with civil, political, military, and religious functions; but, in the final analysis, the satraps of Persia are Persian, the pashas of the Grand Turk are Turks, and the sultans of Tartary are Tartars. China does not seek her mandarins in the homeland of Genghis Khan, her conqueror. America, on the contrary, received everything from Spain, who, in effect, deprived her of the experience that she would have gained from the exercise of an active tyranny by not allowing her to take part in her own domestic affairs and administration. This exclusion made it impossible for us to acquaint ourselves with the management of public affairs; nor did we enjoy that personal consideration, of such great value in major revolutions, that the brilliance of power inspires in the eyes of the multitude. In brief, Gentlemen, we were deliberately kept in ignorance and cut off from the world in all matters relating to the science of government.

Subject to the threefold yoke of ignorance, tyranny, and vice, the American people have been unable to acquire knowledge, power, or [civic] virtue. The lessons we received and the models we studied, as pupils of such pernicious teachers, were most destructive. We have been ruled more by deceit than by force, and we have been degraded more by vice than by superstition. Slavery is the daughter of Darkness: an ignorant people is a blind instrument of its own destruction. Ambition and intrigue abuse the credulity and experience of men lacking all political, economic, and civic knowledge; they adopt pure illusion as reality; they take license for liberty, treachery for patriotism, and vengeance for justice. This situation is similar to that of the robust blind man who, beguiled by his strength, strides forward with all the assurance of one who can see, but, upon hitting every variety of obstacle, finds himself unable to retrace his steps.

If a people, perverted by their training, succeed in achieving their liberty, they will soon lose it, for it would be of no avail to endeavor to explain to them that happiness consists in the practice of virtue; that the rule of law is more powerful than the rule of tyrants, because, as the laws are more inflexible, everyone should submit to their beneficent austerity; that proper morals, and not force, are the bases of law; and that to practice justice is to practice liberty. Therefore, Legislators, your work is so much the more arduous, inasmuch as you have to reeducate men who have been corrupted by erroneous illusions and false incentives. Liberty, says Rousseau, is a succulent morsel, but one difficult to digest. Our weak fellow-citizens will have to strengthen their spirit greatly before they can digest the wholesome nutriment of freedom. Their limbs benumbed by chains, their sight dimmed by the darkness of dungeons, and their strength sapped by the pestilence of servitude, are they capable of marching toward the august temple of Liberty without faltering? Can they come near enough to bask in its brilliant rays and to breathe freely the pure air which reigns therein?

Legislators, mediate well before you choose. Forget not that you are to lay the political foundation for a newly born nation which can rise to the heights of greatness that Nature has marked out for it if you but proportion this foundation in keeping with the high plane that it aspires to attain. Unless your choice is based upon the peculiar tutelary experience of the Venezuelan people—a factor that should guide you in determining the nature and form of government you are about to adopt for the well-being of the people—and, I repeat, unless you happen upon the right type of government, the result of our reforms will again be slavery. . . .
The more I admire the excellence of the federal Constitution of Venezuela, the more I am convinced of the impossibility of its application to our state. And, to my way of thinking, it is a marvel that its prototype in North America endures so successfully and has not been overthrown at the first sign of adversity or danger. Although the people of North America are a singular model of political virtue and moral rectitude; although the nation was cradled in liberty, reared on freedom, and maintained by liberty alone; and—I must reveal everything—although those people, so lacking in many respects, are unique in the history of mankind, it is a marvel, I repeat, that so weak and complicated a government as the federal system has managed to govern them in the difficult and trying circumstances of their past. But, regardless of the effectiveness of this form of government with respect to North America, I must say that it has never for a moment entered my mind to compare the position and character of two states as dissimilar as the English-American and the Spanish-American. Would it not be most difficult to apply to Spain the English system of political, civil, and religious liberty? Hence, it would be even more difficult to adapt to Venezuela the laws of North America. Does not [Montesquieu’s] *L’Esprit des lois* state that laws should be suited to the people for whom they are made; that it would be a major coincidence if those of one nation could be adapted to another; that laws must take into account the physical conditions of the country, climate, character of the land, location, size, and mode of living of the people; that they should be in keeping with the degree of liberty that the Constitution can sanction respecting the religion of the inhabitants, their inclinations, resources, numbers, commerce, habits, and customs? This is the code we must consult, not the code of Washington!

Question:
1. What advice did Bolívar offer to those forging new governments in South America? Why did Bolívar’s ideas appeal to those who advocated dictatorships as the best form of government for Latin America?
21.5 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: The Communist Manifesto

It is impossible to underestimate the importance of the social and political philosophy of Karl Marx (1818–1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820–1895). Their writings shaped socialist movements throughout Europe, as well as revolutions around the world. The Communist Manifesto (1848) was meant to inspire all workers to unite in common cause.

Source: From Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei (text of 1848; later clarifications by Engels are in parentheses). Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1955, pp. 5–50, passim. Translated by Henry A. Myers.

CONFRONTATION BETWEEN CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM

A specter is passing through Europe—the specter of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have joined in a holy crusade against this specter: Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French radicals and German police. . . .

Bourgeoisie and Proletarians

The whole (written) history of society up to now has been the history of class struggles. . . .

Modern bourgeois society, rising from the ruins of feudal society, did not do away with class antagonisms. It only substituted new classes, new conditions of oppression and new forms of struggle for the old ones.

Our period, however, the bourgeois period, is distinguished by the fact that it has simplified class antagonisms. All society is splitting more and more into two great hostile camps, into two large classes opposing each other directly: bourgeoisie and proletariat. . . .

Large-scale industry established the world market for which the discovery of America had prepared the way. The world market has given unlimited development to commerce, navigation, and overland communication. This has had a reciprocal effect on the expansion of industry: the bourgeoisie has developed, increased its funds for investment, and forced all the classes left over from the Middle Ages into obscurity to the same extent that commerce, shipping, and railroad construction have expanded.

We can thus see how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long chain of developments, a series of revolutions in the way production and trade have been carried on.

Each of these stages in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by corresponding political progress (of that class). The bourgeoisie—as an oppressed class under the domination of feudal lords, as an armed and self-governing association in free cities, here in control of an independent urban republic, there serving as a monarch’s tax-paying Third Estate—served to balance the power of the nobility in semi-feudal or absolute monarchies with the growth of hand-tool industry and generally became the mainstay of the large monarchies. Finally, with the establishment of large industry and the world market the bourgeoisie conquered exclusive political domination for itself in modern states with representative governments. Those holding authority in modern states are only a committee looking out for the common class interests of the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie has played a highly revolutionary role in history.

Wherever the bourgeoisie has taken over, it has destroyed all feudal, patriarchal, or idyllic relationships. It has relentlessly broken all those bright, multicolored feudal ties which bound men to their natural leaders, leaving no ties between men and man except naked interest, the bond of “cash payment” devoid of all feeling. It has drowned the holy ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, and even of top middle-class sentimentality in the ice-cold water of egotistical calculation. It has reduced personal importance to exchange value and substituted one single unscrupulous freedom for countless hard-earned and chartered freedoms. In a word, it has replaced exploitation veiled in religious and political illusions with open, shameless, direct and brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has torn away the halo from every occupation regarded up to now with respect or awe. It has turned the physician, the attorney, the poet and the scientist into its own hired hands.

The bourgeoisie has ripped the ever so sentimental veil from family relationships and reduced them to purely monetary relations. . . .
By rapidly improving all instruments of production and by making communication infinitely easier, the bourgeoisie drags all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it levels all Chinese walls to the ground and with which it forces the most fervent hatred of barbarians for foreigners to give way. It compels all nations to adopt bourgeois methods of production if they want to survive. It forces them to introduce so-called civilization among themselves, that is, to become bourgeois. In short, the bourgeoisie creates a world in its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the countryside to the rule of the city. It has raised enormous cities, greatly increasing the urban population numerically in relation to the rural one, and has thus rescued a significant part of the population from the idiocy of rural life. As it has made the countryside dependent on the city, it has also made barbarian and semi-barbarian peoples dependent on civilized peoples, agricultural populations on bourgeois ones, and the Orient on the Occident.

During its class domination of scarcely one hundred years the bourgeoisie has created more colossal means of production and greater quantities of productive forces than have all past generations together. Subduing forces of nature, introducing machinery, steam navigation, railroads, and telegraphy, applying chemistry to industry and agriculture, clearing whole continents for cultivation, making rivers navigable, conjuring up whole populations to order—as if they were raising them out of the ground—what earlier century could have dreamed that such forces of production were asleep in the womb of associated labor?

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie destroyed feudalism are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself. The bourgeoisie, however, has not only forged the weapons of its own destruction but has also produced the men who will bear these weapons against them: the modern workers—the proletarians.

To the same extent to which the bourgeoisie—that is, capital—develops, the proletariat, the modern working class, also develops. Proletarians live only as long as they can find work, and they find work only as long as their work increases capital. These workers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity like any other article of commerce and are therefore exposed to all the uncertainties of competition and to all the fluctuations of the market.

Proletarians and Communists

What is the relationship of the Communists to the proletarians in general?

The Communists are no particular party to be contrasted with other workers’ parties. They have no interests separate from the whole proletariat.

They do not want to shape the proletarian movement in accordance with any special (sectarian) principles. The Communists are distinguished from the rest of the proletarian parties only by the fact that, on one hand, they strongly emphasize the common interests of the world proletariat independent of nationality considerations in the different national struggles of the proletariats and, on the other hand, they always represent the interests of the total movement in the different stages of development which the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie goes through.

The Communists are thus really the most committed part of workers’ parties of all countries, the part which continually drives them further; their understanding of theory gives them insight into the conditions, the course, and the general outcomes of the proletarian movement in advance of the remaining mass of the proletariat.

The most immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of bourgeois domination, and conquest of political power by the proletariat.

On this subject, the Communists can sum up their theory in one phrase: abolition of private property.

We Communists have been accused of wanting to abolish that property which has been personally acquired through the owner’s own efforts, property which is supposed to be the basis of all personal freedom, activity, and independence.

Property which has been worked for—acquired through the owner’s own efforts! Are you talking about the property of the petty bourgeoisie or that of the small farmers which preceded bourgeois property? We don’t need to abolish that: the development of industry has been abolishing it and is abolishing it every day.

Or are you talking about modern bourgeois private property?

Now, does the proletarian’s work for wages create any property for him? In no way. It creates capital, i.e., property, which exploits wage labor and which can increase only under the condition that it produces a fresh supply of labor for wages, in order to exploit it in turn. Property in its current form is based on the antagonism of capital and wage labor. Let us observe the nature of this antagonism:

To be a capitalist means to occupy not only a purely personal but also a social position in production. Capital is a community product and can be put into motion only through the common activity of many members, indeed, in the final analysis, only through the common activity of all members of society.
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Capital is thus not a personal force, but rather social power.
When capital is thus transformed into property belonging in common to all members of the community, personal property is not being changed into social property. Only the social character of property is changed. It loses its class character. . . .

In bourgeois society, living labor is only a means for increasing stored labor. In Communist society, stored labor is only a means for expanding, enriching, and improving the way workers live.

In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society, capital is individual and personal while the active individual person is dependent and depersonalized.

And the bourgeoisie calls the abolition of this relationship the abolition of individuality and freedom! And they are right. It is a question to be sure, of abolishing bourgeois individuality, independence, and freedom. . . .

Elimination of the family! Even the greatest radicals are horrified over this shameful intention of the Communists.

What is the basis of the present-day family, the bourgeois family? Capital, private gain. In its completely developed form, it exists only for the bourgeoisie; however, it requires two complements to maintain it: deprivation of proletarian family life and public prostitution.

The bourgeois family will naturally disappear with the disappearance of these complements to it, and both complements will disappear when capital disappears. . . .

All bourgeois sayings about family and education, about intimate relations of trust between parents and children, are becoming all the more disgusting as all family ties are torn apart for the proletarians by the development of big industry and their children are transformed into simple articles of trade and labor.

“But you Communists want to introduce the practice of holding women in common!” the whole bourgeoisie shouts back in chorus.

The bourgeois sees in his wife only an instrument of production. He hears that instruments of production are to be utilized for the common good, and naturally he can think of nothing other than that the fate of being common property will also fall to women.

He does not suspect that the real aim is to eliminate the position of women as mere instruments of production.

By the way, nothing is more ridiculous than the highly moral indignation of our bourgeois over the alleged official “community of women” of the Communists. The Communists do not need to introduce the community of women; it has almost always existed.

Our bourgeois men, not satisfied with the fact that the wives and daughters of their proletarians are at their disposal, to say nothing of public prostitution, take great pleasure in alternately seducing each others’ wives.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a community of married women. The most Communists can be accused of is a desire to introduce an official and open community of women, to take the place of a hypocritically concealed one. It goes without saying that with the abolition of the prevailing system of production the community of women arising from it, i.e., legal and illegal prostitution, will disappear.

Communists are further accused of wanting to abolish the fatherland and nationality.

Workers have no fatherland. We cannot take from them what they do not have. When the proletariat first takes over political rule and raises itself to the (leading) class of the nation, the proletariat will be constituting itself as the nation. It will then be “national” itself, although not at all in the bourgeois sense.

More and more national differences and antagonisms are disappearing already among the peoples due to the development of the bourgeoisie, freedom of trade, the world market, the uniformity of industrial production, and the living conditions corresponding with it.

Proletarian dominance will erase them even more. United action, among the civilized countries at least, is one of the basic preconditions for liberating the proletariat.

To the extent that the exploitation of one individual by another is eliminated, the exploitation of one nation by another will be eliminated.

The hostile stance of nations towards each other will disappear as the antagonism of classes inside the nation disappears.

The charges against Communism raised on religious, philosophical and ideological grounds in general do not deserve extensive discussion.

Does it require deep insight to grasp that when human living conditions—and with them social existences and relationships—change, their images, views, and concepts, in a word, their consciousness, will change as well?

What does the history of ideas prove other than that the output of the human mind changes itself to fit changes in material production? The ruling ideas of a period have always been only the ideas of the ruling class. . . .
In short, the Communists support every movement everywhere against existing social and political conditions. In all these movements, they emphasize the property issue, regardless of how pronounced or faintly developed it is perceived to be, as the fundamental issue of the movement.

Finally, the Communists work everywhere for mutual understanding and support among the democratic parties of all countries.

The Communists scorn any concealment of their views and intentions. They declare openly that their goals can be reached only through the violent overthrow of all social structures which have existed previously. Let the ruling classes tremble at the prospect of a Communist Revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose from it but their chains. They have a world to win.

Proletarians of all countries unite!

**Question:**
1. Marx and Engels say there have always been class antagonisms. Why do they believe that the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is different from previous class antagonism?
21.6 Michael Harrington, from *Socialism: Past and Future*

In the excerpt from *Socialism: Past and Future* included below, the historian Michael Harrington outlines the history of socialism, stressing the diversity of opinions and ideas contained within the socialist tradition. In particular, he examines the development and spread of utopian socialist visions.


People speak of socialism. We should speak of socialisms.

There is an amnesia about the socialist tradition that abandons entire definitions of that ideal made by serious mass movements. There are dictionary definitions—socialism is the public ownership of the means of production and distribution—which are faded abstractions of one fragment of a rich conceptual heritage. There are Marxist statements, often Delphic in their vagueness but always suffused with a sense of history, which are turned into transhistorical truths and chiseled into stone. And there are simplistic assumptions that the antisocialist practice of states calling themselves socialist describes something called “really-existing” socialism.

What is needed, if socialism is to find a new relevance for the twenty-first century, is some sense of its enormous diversity and complexity. This chapter and the next will survey socialisms, the various and conflicting ways that the movement tried to give specific meaning to its profound and imprecise demand for democratic socializing. This history is far from linear: it opens with the recent rediscovery of the earliest “utopian” socialist tradition and its relevance to the future. And it attempts to learn from the terrible socialisms—the antisocialist “socialisms”—as well.

All of this is not an act of piety toward the past and certainly not an attempt to write, even in outline, a survey of socialist thought. It is thematic, focusing on a few particularly revealing moments. It frankly and knowingly concentrates on that part of the past that might be usable—as either a good or a horrible example—in building the future. That is fully apparent in the very first socialism to be discussed, that of the “utopians.”

It was no accident that utopian socialism was rediscovered in the 1960s and had a significant impact on important political movements in the West a century and a half after it began. Suddenly, ideas that had been given an elegant, somewhat respectful burial by Marx and Engels seemed to speak to significant numbers of the post-World War II generation in the advanced capitalist countries. Utopian socialism also took on a new incarnation in “African” socialism. And it pointed toward a new history of the nineteenth-century past in which the long-forgotten struggles of artisans suddenly came to life because scholars now lived in the age of the computer.

I

It is, Martin Buber wrote, “the goal of Utopian socialism . . . to substitute society for State to the greatest degree possible, moreover a society that is ‘genuine’ and not a State in disguise. “That is as good a definition as you will find—even though it is more complex than it might at first seem. For though utopia exalted society as against the state, it led to technocracy as well as anarchism, to Stalinism as well as the Israeli *kibbutz*. And it may well be relevant to the twenty-first century in ways that its nineteenth-century progenitors, for all of their talent for the imaginary and even the fantastic, would never have imagined.

This early socialism was concerned with morality, community, and feminism. None of its founders—Henri de Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, and Robert Owen—was a democrat, but the movements they inspired were profoundly democratic. Saint-Simon tried to win both Napoleon and Louis XVIII to his ideas, and some of his followers reached out to Metternich; Fourier waited for some wealthy philanthropist to make his proposals possible; and Robert Owen tried to convince both the lords and bishops of his native Britain and the Congress of the United States. So one has to look, not simply at the ideas that the utopian thinkers put down on paper, but at the shrewd readings made of them by people without much formal education.

In most histories, the first modern socialist is Gracchus Babeuf, the leader of the Conspiracy of Equals during the French Revolution, a man who tried to carry Jacobinism to its ultimate and radical conclusion. In contrast, these utopians tended to be anti-Jacobin, decentralist and social rather than centralist and political, and two of them, Fourier and Saint-Simon, had unhappy personal experiences with the upheaval in France. They wrote as the industrial revolution was taking off. Owen was a factory owner, and Saint-Simon might be said to have been the first philosopher of industrialism and, for that matter, the first “historical materialist,” with his emphasis on the underlying importance of the economic in social and political history. Both of them greeted the new technological world as a means to their utopian ends. Fourier is the exception, the one of the three who was not that enthusiastic about industrial progress. Yet he was far ahead of his time as a thinker who made an almost Freudian definition of what socialism would be.
These are all familiar facts. But there are ambivalences and ambiguities concealed within them that are not so obvious and yet had a profound impact upon subsequent history. Above all, there was a strange mix of the technocratic and the decentralist in Saint-Simon and in some ways in Robert Owen. It was a major source of that dangerous imprecision in Karl Marx and most of the socialists of the twentieth century about the meaning of socialization.

Saint-Simon was a champion of industrial progress and saw the concentration of industry and, above all, of finance as a precondition of his most radical hopes. At the same time, he was caught up in a Romantic fascination with the organic as opposed to the artificial and saw the high point of medieval society—with its ordered, functional hierarchies—as one of the great positive accomplishments of humanity. That attitude was, of course, a staple of the reactionaries and conservatives, of Maistre, Bonald and Edmund Burke, and all the others who fulminated against those who would try to plan the future on the basis of some kind of a rational model. Yet Saint-Simon, who was explicitly influenced by the French variant of that conservative school, was one of the first to formulate the concept of economic planning.

This celebrant of industrial centralization was also the first major theorist to proclaim the “withering away of the state.” In the past, Saint-Simon argued, government had been imposed upon society from the top down; it was not organic. But now society was becoming industrial, the economic and the technological were the critical determinants of everything else, and there would be no need of politics. The functional organization of production was all the leadership and direction that was needed. To be sure, there had to be leaders—Saint-Simon, like the other utopians, was appalled by the ugly competitive anarchy of laisser-faire—but now they would be defined organically, by their role in the economy, and not by an extraneous state.

In his initial version of this theory, the leaders were to be the wise men, the scholars and engineers. Later, Saint-Simon saw them as the captains of industry—les industriels—and counterposed them, and everyone else who worked, to the parasitic bourgeois who simply lived off of capital. Ultimately, Saint-Simon and his followers looked to bankers to take a pride of place among the industriels, seeing them as planners who, by their rational criteria for investment, overcame the wasteful competition sponsored by the lazy bourgeoisie. As a result, this utopian socialist was recognized as a mentor by some of the most successful financiers in France.

But how can one man inspire both the banking industry and the socialist movement? In a profound sense, Saint-Simon himself did not effect that paradox. He remained true to the obvious technocratic implications of his analysis—although in 1819 he did propose in his Parabole that it was possible to dispense with the entire ecclesiastical and bureaucratic apparatus of the French state, a suggestion that got him into trouble with his more conservative supporters. It was the Saint-Simonians who squared the circle. If government was now to be replaced by society as defined functionally, then the critical question became: What is society and who are its functional leaders? For Saint-Simon, the answer was industrialists and bankers—but bankers and industrialists who were viewed as workers in contrast to the coupon-clipping bourgeois. Saint-Simon died in 1825 under the Restoration, and that was his mature view.

But the men and women who elaborated The Doctrine of Saint-Simon, in an enormously influential book of that name, lived and worked immediately before and after the Revolution of 1830 and, in the name of an orthodox “exposition” of the master’s thoughts, radically changed it. The state, they said, would turn into “the ASSOCIATION OF WORKERS.” Saint-Simon could have agreed with the verbal formula, since he thought of a banker as a worker—but that was not what the new interpretation had in mind. It referred to the new class of proletarians. Moreover, a striking word had come into play, one that echoes throughout the history of French socialism: association. Saint-Simon himself had never used it, and, as read by workers and revolutionaries, it came to mean that socialism was a society controlled from the bottom up by associations of workers. That notion was to be key to the syndicalist socialism of Proudhon and to the utopianism of the arch anti-utopian, Karl Marx.

At the same time, the Saint-Simonians defined both the class struggle and the concept of exploitation. Chapter 6 of The Doctrine was headed, “The successive transformation of the exploitation of man by man and of the right of property: Master-Slave—Patrician-Plebian—Lord-Serf Parasite-Worker.” That formulation anticipates, but is transformed in, the first line of The Communist Manifesto. The chapter went on to show that a “fair” contract between a rich parasite and a poor worker was inherently unfair and brought wealth to the former and poverty to the latter. And that, of course, is a central theme of Das Kapital.

These ideas did not remain the property of a small sect of true believers. Particularly after the disillusionment with the Revolution of 1830, Saint-Simonianism became a major movement in France, in large part because one of the central themes of the utopian socialists was feminism. Indeed, it can be argued that the cultural and social radicalism of the Saint-Simonian movement was decisive in transforming a technocratic theory into a socialist and democratic vision.

All three of the great utopians placed a major emphasis upon the role of women. “The change in an historical epoch,” Fourier had written, “can always be determined by the progress of woman toward freedom, because in the relation of women to man, of the weak to the strong, the victory of human nature over brutality is most evident. The greed of feminine emancipation is the natural measure of general emancipation.” Indeed, Fourier’s basic definition of community was that it would put an end to instinctual repression, allow the human passions to become the mainspring of social life, and lead to erotic, as well as economic, liberation.
“Too many restraints have been imposed on the passion of love,” Fourier wrote. “This is proved by the fact that no man wishes to obey the legal injunction to practice continence outside of marriage. The infractions of men have inspired those of women, and love in civilized society is nothing but universal anarchy and secret insurrection.” People with exotic sexual tastes would, so long as their activity was consensual and did not do bodily harm, “meet regularly at international convocations which would be pilgrimages as sacred to them as ‘the journey to Mecca for Muslims.’”

Some of the Owenites had a similar view. “If you love one another,” one of them told the young people, “go together at any time without any law or ceremony.” One of the reasons for this attitude was a feeling that the bourgeoisie bought and sold wives and even encouraged prostitution. Sex, these utopian movements said, had to be freed in every way from commercialization. In the case of the Saint-Simonians, feminism was probably a decisive factor in turning the movement toward the Left and democracy. That is how the Saint-Simonian movement, which was Romantic where the master was technological, became a significant force in France in the 1830s, with a nationwide network of “temples of humanity” and some 40,000 adherents and intellectual sympathizers, including George Sand, Heinrich Heine, Goethe (the ending of Faust is Saint-Simonian), and Franz Liszt. Flora Tristan, a fascinating and influential woman from an extraordinary family—her brother became president of Peru, her grandson was the painter Paul Gauguin—combined two of the central Saint-Simonian themes: she saw the “equality of rights between men and women as the sole means of establishing Human Unity”; and she believed that the democratic organization of the working people would become a self-governing estate of the realm.

As George Lichtheim summarized the Saint-Simonians:

Here, all of a sudden, there was a new vision of man no longer dull and rationalistic, but sentimental and passionate. The synthesis operated at every level: intellectual, moral, political, metaphysical. Socialism was a faith—that was the great discovery the Saint-Simonians had made! It was the “new Christianity, “and it would emancipate those whom the old religion had left in chains—above all woman and the proletariat!

Owen’s ideas went through a similar metamorphosis, with the difference that the master himself participated in both the conservative and radical interpretations of his thought. In the first phase, which lasted from the turn of the century into the 1820s, Owen was an imaginative industrialist who discovered that acting decently toward his workers changed their moral conduct and increased productivity at the same time. He then tried to convince the British and American elite that social justice was a pragmatic investment. During the very hard times after the Napoleonic Wars, there were widespread misery, unemployment, and, as a result, fear of revolution. The cost of caring for the poor—outlays that had been undertaken in considerable measure as an insurance policy against a French-style revolution in Britain—rose even as the wartime prosperity ended.

As E. P. Thompson put it, “The poor were unsightly, a source of guilt, a heave charge on the country, and a danger.” In this setting, Owen proposed that the poor be put into “Villages of Cooperation” where, after initial public funding, they would pay their own way and engage in useful work that would make them disciplined and temperate. Cobbett wrote of the scheme: “Mr. Owen’s object appears to me to be to cover the face of the country with workhouses, to rear up a community of slaves, and consequently to render the labouring part of the People absolutely dependent upon men of property.” The Fourierists, with their Romantic values, were suspicious of Owen all along; but some of the Saint-Simoni-ans, with their scientific emphasis, were attracted by his hardheadedness.

But then a number of things happened, and not only Owenism but Owen himself moved from humane elitism to a kind of working-class radicalism. One factor was that Owen’s atheism became widely known and he was effectively shut out of polite society. Even more important, the Anti-Combination acts, which had been passed in 1799 and 1800 at the height of anti-Jacobin sentiment and which had done so much to frustrate organizing among the workers, were repealed in 1824–25. Trade-union and cooperative activity began to grow, and when Owen returned from his trip to the United States in 1829, he found himself in contact with a mass movement of unionists and cooperators. The sophisticated elitist became a tribune of the people.

Owenism was thus transformed from a philanthropic, top-down scheme for evading the class struggle through cooperation into a bottom-up insurgency of working people who were determined to rely on their own strength. At the same time, the cultural radicalism that had inspired Owen to denounce all religions as “a mass of iniquitous error” now asserted itself in his attack on marriage as “a Satanic device of the Priesthood to place and keep mankind within their slavish superstitions.” In the new world, he said, “there will be no marriages of the priest or giving in marriage.” This trend was reinforced, Barbara Taylor documents, when the Saint-Simonians came to propagandize the English in 1832 and advocated “moral marriage,” that is, free unions based on affection and without the sanction of official ceremony. The French and British socialists, one hostile observer said, address themselves “to the weaker sex, upon whom they hope to make a fatal impression, as the serpent succeeded with Eve.”

As Owenism developed in this fashion, it also converged with some of Fourier’s communitarian ideas. Fourier was not simply an isolated—and sometimes half-mad—proponent of fascinating utopias, although he was certainly that. He answered the standard conservative challenge, Who will do the dirty work?, with the proposition that “small hordes” of
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children, who love to play in the mud, would exercise that function. More seriously, he looked to the transformation of the very nature of work: in his commune (the phalanstère), there would be two thousand people, none of whom would work more than two hours at the same job, all of whom would freely choose the task they liked best and become masters of it.

These utopian ideas—if not the “anti-lion,” a gentle version of that animal capable of lying down with lambs, that he imagined would come to exist in the utopian era—had a significant impact upon the Saint-Simonians, particularly when they talked of “associations” as the key to the future, reached out to the Transcendentalists at Brook Farm in the United States, and found echoes in the cooperative movement in Britain. There was a reason why such notions found a surprising resonance among ordinary people, and it is most visible in E. P. Thompson’s description of the Owenites.

A good number of them were artisans. They could become cooperators in part because they had confidence in their own skill and the value of their work. They, like most of the early socialists, believed in some variant of the labor theory of value—that honest work is the source of wealth, and therefore it is the honest worker who should be the recipient of that wealth. This view coincided with their own personal experience. And they were often political radicals who believed in a “republican” ideology in which no citizen should even have to bow down to any other citizen. America, which seethed with utopian experiments during the nineteenth century, had the same tendencies. We know that the Left—republican—wing of the revolution in this country was, more often than not, supported by artisans.

So were the radical and trade-union movements of the early nineteenth century. The first labor parties in world history were formed in 1828 and 1829 in Philadelphia and New York, and the feminist and interracialist, Frances Wright, found appreciative artisan, audiences in the process. This was a stratum hungry for ideas, which met to discuss books, and which often reinterpreted the programs of their “betters”—as they did so dramatically in the case of Owen and Saint-Simon. They were joined by outcasts from the unskilled and deracinated poor, and by middle-class reformers.

The utopians failed. In Europe, their high-water mark was the 1830s, and they were not really an organized force by the time of the upheavals of 1848. But this is not quite precise. There was a second definition of socialism that came very much to the fore in Paris in 1848, and it is associated with the name of Louis Blanc. Socialism, this tendency said in an anticipation of the Keynesian social democracy of the 1960s, is full employment, the right of every worker to a job. Blanc, who had a brief moment of power in the February revolution, wanted to fulfill that promise by national work shops. But—and here this progenitor of an early democratic socialism acknowledged a debt to the utopians in general and Fourier in particular—the workers were to elect the directors and were to become part of local communes sharing housing and social services.

Moreover, the struggle of artisans throughout the nineteenth century against a centralized, machine-run technology, which changed the nature of work and robbed them of the value of their acquired skills, was clearly connected to the utopian insistence on the creativity and dignity of work. In the United States, the historian David Montgomery has described a long war of attrition between those skilled workers and management about who would control the workplace itself. In that down-to-earth history, one hears the ongoing relevance of Fourier and Owen.

Utopian socialism, then, was not the preserve of scholars in their studies. It was a movement that gave the first serious definition of socialism as communitarian, moral, feminist, committed to the transformation of work. That tradition came to be regarded as an immature first step, a prelude, rather than as something of enduring value. If there is to be a twenty-first-century socialism worthy of the name, it will, among other things, have to go two hundred years into the past to recover the practical and theoretical ideals of the utopians.

Question:
1. What are the virtues and shortcomings of utopian socialism?
21.7 Anarchism: Michael Bakunin

The anarchist revolutionary Michael Bakunin (1814–1876) was born into an aristocratic Russian family. Despite his background, he became active in revolutionary politics and was eventually exiled to Siberia. After escaping Siberia in 1861, he traveled to Britain where he became an influential figure in socialist politics. His belief in radical individualism brought him into conflict with Karl Marx. In the document included here, Bakunin outlined his social and political principles.


I. AIM OF THE SOCIETY

1. The aim of this society is the triumph of the principle of revolution in the world, and consequently the radical overthrow of all presently existing religious, political, economic and social organizations and institutions and the reconstitution first of European and subsequently of world society on the basis of liberty, reason, justice and work.

2. This kind of task cannot be achieved overnight. The association is therefore constituted for an indefinite period, and will cease to exist only on the day when the triumph of its principle throughout the world removes its raison de être.1

II. REVOLUTIONARY CATECHISM

1. Denial of the existence of a real, extra-terrestrial, individual God, and consequently also of any revelation and any divine intervention in the affairs of the human world. Abolition of the service and worship of divinity.

2. In replacing the worship of God by respect and love for humanity, we assert human reason as the one criterion of truth; human conscience as the basis of justice; individual and collective liberty as the only creator of order for mankind.

3. Liberty is the absolute right of all adult men and women to seek no sanction for their actions except their own conscience and their own reason, to determine them only of their own free will, and consequently to be responsible for them to themselves first of all, and then to the society of which they are a part, but only in so far as they freely consent to be a part of it.

4. It is quite untrue that the freedom of the individual is bounded by that of every other individual. Man is truly free only to the extent that his own freedom, freely acknowledged and reflected as in a mirror by the free conscience of all other men, finds in their freedom the confirmation of its infinite scope. Man is truly free only among other equally free men, and since he is free only in terms of mankind, the enslavement of any one man on earth, being an offense against the very principle of humanity, is a denial of the liberty of all.

5. Every man’s liberty can be realized, therefore, only by the equality of all. The realization of liberty in legal and actual equality is justice.

6. There is only one dogma, one law, one moral basis for men, and that is liberty. To respect your neighbor’s liberty is duty; to love, help and serve him, virtue.

7. Absolute rejection of any principle of authority and of raison d’État.2 Human society, which was originally a natural fact, prior to liberty and the awakening of the human mind, and which later became a religious fact, organized on the principle of divine and human authority, must now be reconstituted on the basis of liberty, henceforward to be the sole determinant of its organization, both political and economic. Order in society must be the outcome of the greatest possible development of all local, collective and individual liberties. . .

---

1 French: reason for being.
2 French: reason of State; a measure taken by a government for the continuance of the state.
9. Political organization. It is impossible to determine a concrete, universal and compulsory norm for the internal development and political organization of nations, since the existence of each is subordinate to a host of variable historical, geographical and economic factors which never permit of the establishment of an organizational model equally applicable and acceptable to all. Furthermore, any undertaking of this nature, being utterly devoid of practical utility, would militate against the richness and spontaneity of life, which delights in infinite diversity, and would in addition be contrary to the very principle of liberty. Nevertheless, there do exist essential, absolute conditions without which the practical realization and organization of liberty will always be impossible. These conditions are:

9(a). The radical abolition of all official religion and every privileged or state-protected, -financed or -maintained church. Absolute freedom of conscience and propaganda for all, each man having the unlimited option of building as many temples as he pleases to his gods, whatever their denomination, and of paying and maintaining the priests of his religion.

9(b). Seen as religious corporations, churches shall enjoy none of the political rights which will belong to productive associations, shall be unable to inherit or possess wealth in common, excepting their houses or establishments of prayer, and shall never be allowed to participate in the upbringing of children, since their sole aim in life is the systematic negation of morality and liberty, and the practice of sorcery for profit.

9(c). Abolition of monarchy, republic.

9(d). Abolition of class, rank, privilege and distinction in all its forms. Complete equality of political rights for all men and all women; universal suffrage.

9(e). Abolition, dissolution, and moral, political, legal, bureaucratic and social bankruptcy of the custodial, transcendent, centralist state, lackey and alter ego of the church, and as such the permanent source of poverty, degradation and subjugation among the people. As a natural consequence, abolition of all state universities—public education must be the exclusive prerogative of the free communes and associations; abolition of state magistracy—all judges to be elected by the people; abolition of the criminal and civil codes currently in force in Europe—because all of these, being equally inspired by the worship of God, state, family as a religious and political entity, and property, are contrary to human rights, and because only by liberty can the code of liberty be created. Abolition of banks, and all other state credit institutions. Abolition of all central administration, bureaucracies, standing armies and state police.

9(f). Immediate and direct election of all public officials, both civil and judicial, as well of all national, provincial and communal councilors or representatives, by popular vote, which is to say by the universal suffrage of all adult men and women.

9(g). Reorganization of each region, taking as its basis and starting point the absolute freedom of individual, productive association and commune.

9(h). Individual rights.

(i). The right of every man or woman to be completely supported, cared for, protected, brought up and educated from birth to coming of age in all public, primary, secondary, higher, industrial, artistic and scientific schools at the expense of society.

(ii). The equal right of each to be advised and assisted by the latter, as far as possible, at the outset of the career which each new adult will freely choose, after which the society which has declared him completely free will exercise no further supervision or authority over him, decline all responsibility toward him, and owe him nothing more than respect and if necessary protection for his liberty.

(iii). The liberty of every adult man and woman must be absolute and complete freedom to come and go, openly to profess any shade of opinion, to be idle or active, immoral or moral, in other words to dispose of his own person and his own belongings as he pleases and to be answerable to no one; freedom either to live honestly, by their own labor, or shamefully, by exploiting charity or individual trust, given that such charity and trust be voluntary and be proffered by adults only.

(iv). Unconditional freedom for every variety of propaganda, whether through conversation, the press or in public or private meetings, without any constraint but the natural corrective power of public opinion. Absolute liberty of associations, not excepting those whose aims may be or seem to be immoral, and even including those whose aim is the corruption and [destruction] of individual and public liberty.

(ix). Absolute abolition of all cruel and degrading sentences, corporal punishment and the death penalty as sanctioned and enforced by the law. Abolition of all those indefinite or protracted punishments which leave no hope and no real possibility of rehabilitation, since crime ought to be considered as sickness, and punishment as cure rather than social retaliation.
(x). Any individual condemned by the laws of any society, commune, province or nation shall retain the right not to submit to the sentence imposed on him, by declaring that he no longer wishes to be part of that society. But in such a case the society in question shall have the concomitant right to expel him from its midst and to declare him outside its warrant and protection.

(xi). Having thus reverted to the natural law of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, at least inside the territory occupied by that society, the individual shall be liable to robbery, ill-treatment and even death without any cause for alarm. Any person will be able to dispose of him like a dangerous animal, although never to subject him or use him as a slave.

10. **Social organization.** Without political equality there is no true political liberty, but political equality will only become possible when there is economic and social equality.

10(a). Equality does not mean the leveling down of individual differences, nor intellectual, moral and physical uniformity among individuals. . . . Nor do economic and social equality mean the leveling down of individual fortunes, in so far as these are products of the ability, productive energy and thrift of an individual. . . .

10(c). Justice, as well as human dignity, demands that each individual should be the child of his own achievements, and only those achievements. We hotly reject the doctrine of hereditary sin, disgrace and responsibility. By the same token, we must reject the illusory heredity of virtue, honors and rights—and of wealth also. The heir to any kind of wealth is no longer the complete child of his own achievements, and in terms of initial circumstance he is privileged.

10(d). **Abolition of the right of inheritance.** As long as this right continues, hereditary differences of class, rank and wealth—in other words, social inequality and privilege—will survive in fact, if not in law. But it is an inescapable social law that defacto inequality always produces inequality of rights: social inequality necessarily becomes political. . . .

10(g). Once the inequality produced by the right of inheritance has been abolished, there will still remain (but to a far lesser degree) the inequality that arises from differences in individual ability, strength and productive capacity—a difference which, while never disappearing altogether, will be of diminishing importance under the influence of an egalitarian upbringing and social system, and which in addition will never weigh upon future generations once there is no more right of inheritance.

10(h). Labor is the sole producer of wealth. Everybody is free, of course, either to die of starvation or to dwell among the wild beasts of the desert or the forest, but anybody who wants to live within society should earn his living by his own work, or run the risk of being considered a parasite, an exploiter of the wealth (that is, the labor) of others, and a thief.

10(i). **Labor** is the fundamental basis of dignity and human rights, for it is only by means of his own free, intelligent work that man becomes a creator in his turn, wins from the surrounding world and his own animal nature his humanity and rights, and creates the world of civilization. . . .

10(l). **The land, with all its natural resources, belongs to all, but will be held only by those who work it.**

10(m). Woman, differing from man but not inferior to him, intelligent, industrious and free like him, is declared his equal both in rights and in all political and social functions and duties.

10(n). Abolition not of the natural but of the legal family, based on civil law and ownership. Religious and civil marriage are replaced by free marriage. Two adult individuals of opposite sex have the right to unite and separate in accordance with their desires and mutual interests and the promptings of their hearts, nor does society have any right either to prevent their union or to hold them to it against their will. . . .

10(o). From the moment of conception until her child is born, a woman is entitled to a social subvention paid not for her benefit but for her child’s. Any mother wishing to feed and rear her children will also receive all the costs of their maintenance and care from society. . . .

10(q). Children belong neither to their parents nor to society but to themselves and their future liberty…. It is true that their parents are their natural protectors, but the legal and ultimate protector is society, which has the right and duty to tend them because its own future depends on the intellectual and moral guidance they receive. Society can only give liberty to adults provided it supervises the upbringing of minors.

10(r). School must take the place of church, with the immense difference that the religious education provided by the latter has no other purpose than to perpetuate the rule of human ignorance or so-called divine authority, whereas school upbringing and education will have no other purpose than the true emancipation of the children upon reaching the age of majority, and will consist of nothing less than their progressive initiation into liberty by the threefold development of their physical and mental powers and their will. Reason, truth, justice, human respect, awareness of personal dignity (inseparable from the human dignity of another), love of liberty for one’s own sake and for others belief in work as the basis and condition of all rights; contempt for unreason, falsehood, injustice, cowardice, slavery and idleness—these must be the keystones of public education. . . .
10(s). As soon as he comes of age, the adolescent will be declared a free citizen and absolute master of his actions. In exchange for the care it has exercised during his infancy, society will ask for three things: that he remain free, that he live by his own labor, and that he respect the liberty of others. And because the crimes and vices by which present-day society is afflicted are the sole outcome of defective social organization, we may be sure that given a form of organization and upbringing based on reason, justice, liberty, human respect and complete equality, good will become the rule and evil a morbid exception, ever decreasing under the all-powerful influence of moralized public opinion.

10(t). The old, the disabled and the sick will be cared for and respected, enjoy all public and social rights, and be generously maintained at the common expense. . . .

III. REQUISITE QUALITIES FOR MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERNATIONAL FAMILY:

He must be an atheist. . . .

He must, like ourselves, be the adversary of the principle of authority. . . .

He must be a revolutionary. He must understand that such a complete and radical transformation of society, which must necessarily involve the downfall of all privilege, monopoly and constituted power, will naturally not occur by peaceful means. . . .

He must understand that the sole and final purpose of this revolution is the true political, economic and social emancipation of the people. . . .

He will therefore despise any secondary movement whose immediate, direct aim is other than the political and social emancipation of the working classes, in other words the people, and will see it either as a fatal error or a shabby trick. Hostile to all compromise and conciliation—henceforward impossible—and to any false coalition with those whose interests make them the natural enemies of the people, he must see that the only salvation for his own country and for the entire world lies in social revolution.

He must understand that the social revolution will necessarily become a European and worldwide revolution.

That the world will inevitably split into two camps, that of the new life and of the old privileges, and that between these two opposing camps, created as in the time of the wars of religion not by national sympathies but by community of ideas and interests, a war of extermination is bound to erupt, with no quarter and no respite. . . .

That this will not be a war of conquest, but of emancipation. . . .

That even in the most apparently hostile countries, once the social revolution breaks out at one point it will find keen and tenacious allies in the popular masses, who will be unable to do other than rally to its banner as soon as they understand and come in contact with its activities and purpose. That it will consequently be necessary to choose the most fertile soil for its beginning, where it has only to withstand the first assault of reaction before expanding to overwhelm the frenzies of its enemies, federalizing all the lands it has absorbed and welding them into a single indomitable revolutionary alliance.

Questions:
1. What is the problem with Western society in Bakunin’s view?
2. According to Bakunin, why must all authority be destroyed?
3. How do you think Bakunin’s philosophy may have influenced twentieth-century political and social ideologies?
PART 22
Industrialization

22.1 Extolling the Virtues of the Manufacturer

In the following excerpt from 1835, a University of Glasgow professor, Andrew Ure, explains the benefits of manufacturing.


This island is pre-eminent among civilized nations for the prodigious development of its factory wealth, and has been therefore long viewed with a jealous admiration by foreign powers. This very pre-eminence, however, has been contemplated in a very different light by many influential members of our own community, and has been even denounced by them as the certain origin of innumerable evils to the people, and of revolutionary convulsions to the state. If the affairs of the kingdom be wisely administered, I believe such allegations and fears will prove to be groundless, and to proceed more from the envy of one ancient and powerful order of the commonwealth, towards another suddenly grown into political importance than from the nature of things.

In the recent discussions concerning our factories, no circumstances is so deserving of remark, as the gross ignorance evinced by our leading legislators and economists, gentlemen well informed in other respects, relative to the nature of those stupendous manufactures which have so long provided the rulers of the kingdom with the resources of war, and a great body of the people with comfortable subsistence; which have, in fact, made this island the arbiter of many nations, and the benefactor of the globe itself.

The blessings which physico-mechanical science has bestowed on society, and the means it has still in store for ameliorating the lot of mankind, have been too little dwelt upon; while, on the other hand, it has been accused of lending itself to the rich capitalists as an instrument for harassing the poor, and of exacting from the operative an accelerated rate of work. It has been said, for example, that the steam-engine now drives the power-looms with such velocity as to urge on their attendant weavers at the same rapid pace; but that the handweaver, not being subjected to this restless agent, can throw his shuttle and move his treddles at his convenience. There is, however, this difference in the two cases, that in the factory, every member of the loom is so adjusted, that the driving force leaves the attendant nearly nothing at all to do, certainly no muscular fatigue to sustain, while it procures for him good, unfailing wages, besides a healthy workshop gratis: whereas the non-factory weaver, having everything to execute by muscular exertion, finds the labour irksome, makes in consequence innumerable short pauses, separately of little account, but great when added together; earns therefore proportionally low wages, while he loses his health by poor diet and the dampness of his hovel. Dr. Carbutt of Manchester says, “With regard to Sir Robert Peel’s assertion a few evenings ago, that the hand-loom weavers are mostly small farmers, nothing can be a greater mistake; they live, or rather they just keep life together, in the most miserable manner, in the cellars and garrets of the town, working sixteen or eighteen hours for the merest pitance.”*

The constant ami and effect of scientific improvement in manufacturers are philanthropic, as they tend to relieve the workmen either from niceties of adjustment which exhaust his mind and fatigue his eyes, or from painful repetition of effort which distort or wear out his frame. At every step of each manufacturing process described in this volume, the humanity of science will be manifest.

If the marshalling of human beings in systematic order for the execution of any technical enterprise were allowed to constitute a factory, this term might embrace every department of civil and military engineering; a latitude of application quite inadmissible.

In its precise acceptation, the Factory system is of recent origin, and may claim England for its birthplace. The mills for throwing silk, or making organza, which were mounted centuries ago in several of the Italian states, and furtively transferred to this country by Sir Thomas Lombe in 1718, contained indeed certain elements of a factory, and probably suggested some hints of those grander and more complex combinations of self-acting machines, which were first embodied half a century later in our cotton manufacture by Richard Arkwright, assisted by gentlemen of Derby, well acquainted with its celebrated silk establishment. But the spinning of an entangled flock of fibres into a smooth thread, which constitutes the main operation with cotton, is in silk superfluous; being already performed by the unerring instinct of a worm, which leaves to human art the simple task of doubling and twisting its regular filaments. The apparatus requisite for this purpose is more elementary, and calls for few of those gradations of machinery which are needed in the carding, drawing, roving, and spinning processes of a cotton-mill.
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When the first water-frames for spinning cotton were erected at Cromford, in the romantic valley of the Derwent, about sixty years ago, mankind were little aware of the mighty revolution which the new system of labour was destined by Providence to achieve, not only in the structure of British society, but in the fortunes of the world at large. Arkwright alone had the sagacity to discern, and the boldness to predict in glowing language, how vastly productive human industry would become, when no longer proportioned in its results to muscular effort, which is by its nature fitful and capricious, but when made to consist in the task of guiding the work of mechanical fingers and arms, regularly impelled with great velocity by some indefatigable physical power. What his judgment so clearly led him to perceive, his energy of will enabled him to realize with such rapidity and success, as would have done honour to the most influential individuals, but were truly wonderful in that obscure and indigent artisan. The main difficulty did not, to my apprehension, lie so much in the invention of a proper self-acting mechanism for drawing out and twisting cotton into a continuous thread, as in the distribution of the different members of the apparatus into one co-operative body, in impelling each organ with its appropriate delicacy and speed, and above all, in training human beings to renounce their desultory habits of work, and to identify themselves with the unvarying regularity of the complex automation. To devise and administer a successful code of factory discipline, suited to the necessities of factory diligence, was the Herculean enterprise, the noble achievement of Arkwright.

The principle of the factory system then is, to substitute mechanical science for hand skill, and the partition of a process into its essential constituents, for the division or graduation of labour among artisans. On the handicraft plan, labour more or less skilled, was usually the most expensive element of production—Materiam superabat opus; but on the automatic plan, skilled labour gets progressively superseded, and will, eventually, be replaced by mere overlookers of machines.

By the infirmity of human nature it happens, that the more skilful the workman, the more self-willed and intractable he is apt to become, and, of course, the less fit a component of a mechanical system, in which, by occasional irregularities, he may do great damage to the whole. The grand object therefore of the modern manufacturer is, through the union of capital and science, to reduce the task of his work-people to the exercise of vigilance and dexterity,—faculties, when concentrated to one process, speedily brought to perfection in the young. In the infancy of mechanical engineering, a machine-factory displayed the division of labour in manifold gradations—the file, the drill, the lathe, having each its different workmen in the order of skill: but the dexterous hands of the filer and driller are now superseded by the planning, the key-groove cutting, and the drilling-machines; and those of the iron and brass turners, by the self-acting slide-lathe.

It is, in fact, the constant aim and tendency of every improvement in machinery to supersede human labour altogether, or to diminish its cost, by substituting the industry of women and children for that of men; or that of ordinary labourers, for trained artisans. In most of the water-twist, or throstle cotton mills, the spinning is entirely managed by females of sixteen years and upwards. The effect of substituting the self-acting mule for the common mule, is to discharge the greater part of the men spinners, and to retain adolescents and children. The proprietor of a factory near Stockport states, in evidence to the commissioners, that by such substitution, he would save 50l. a week in wages, in consequence of dispensing with nearly forty male spinners, at about 25s. of wages each.

Steam-engines furnish the means not only of their support but of their multiplication. They create a vast demand for fuel; and, while they lend their powerful arms to drain the pits and to raise the coals, they call into employment multitudes of miners, engineers, ship-builders, and sailors, and cause the construction of canals and railways: and, while they enable these rich fields of industry to be cultivated to the utmost, they leave thousands of fine arable fields free for the production of food to man, which must have been otherwise allotted to the food of horses. Steam-engines moreover, by the cheapness and steadiness of their action, fabricate cheap goods, and procure in their exchange a liberal supply of the necessaries and comforts of life, produced in foreign lands.

Questions:
1. What were the costs and benefits of the machines and new divisions of labor? Consider not just the product and the technology, but work location, labor force, consumption, class relations, etc.
2. What hopes and fears were expressed about the future of the new technology?
3. How have these hopes and fears materialized (or not) in the past 200 years? Are the hopes and fears still valid or not?
4. How are workers and manufacturers described and by whom? What conclusions can you draw from these descriptions?
5. How might these descriptions have shaped people’s understanding? How might they have been shaped by ideas of the day (consider, for instance, Enlightenment ideas, see Chapter 18).
22.2 Child Labor Inquiry

In this excerpt, a clothier is asked about the condition and behavior of children working in the mills.


Mr. Abraham Whitehead

431. What is your business?—A clothier.
432. Where do you reside?—At Scholes, near Holmfirth.
433. Is not that in the centre of very considerable woolen mills? Yes, for a space of three of four miles; I live nearly in the centre of thirty or forty woollen mills....
436. Are the children and young persons of both sexes employed in these mills?—Yes.
437. At how early an age are children employed?—The youngest age at which children are employed is never under five, but some are employed between five and six in woollen mills at piecing.
438. How early have you observed these young children going to their work, speaking for the present in the summer time?—In the summer time I have frequently seen them going to work between five and six in the morning, and I know the general practice is for them to go as early to all the mills....
439. How late in the evening have you seen them at work, or remarked them returning to their homes?—I have seen them at work in the summer season between nine and ten in the evening; they continue to work as long as they can see, and they can see to work in these mills as long as you could see to read....
441. You say that on your own personal knowledge?—I live near to parents who have been sending their children to mills for a great number of years, and I know positively that these children are every morning in the winter seasons called out of bed between five and six, and in some instances between four and five.
442. Your business as a clothier has often led you into these mills?—Frequently:....

460. What has been the treatment which you have observed that these children received at the mills, to keep them attentive for so many hours at such early ages?—They are generally cruelly treated; so cruelly treated, that they dare not hardly for their lives be too late at their work in a morning.... My heart has been ready to bleed for them when I have seen them so fatigued, for they appear in such a state of apathy and insensibility as really not to know whether they are doing their work or not;....
461. Do they frequently fall into errors and mistakes in piecing when thus fatigued?—Yes; the errors they make when thus fatigued are, that instead of placing the cording in this way [describing it], they are apt to place them obliquely, and that causes a flying, which makes bad yarn; and when the billy-spinner sees that, he takes his strap or the billy-roller, and says, “Damn thee, close it-little devil, close it,” and they smite the child with the strap or the billy-roller....
510. You say that the morals of the children are very bad when confined in these mills; what do you consider to be the situation of children who have nothing to do, and are running about such towns as Leeds, with no employment to keep them out of mischief?—Children that are not employed in mills are generally more moral and better behaved than children who are employed in mills.
511. Those in perfect idleness are better behaved than those that are employed?—That is not a common thing; they either employ them in some kind of business at home, or send them to school.
512. Are there no day-schools to which these factory children go?—They have no opportunity of going to school when they are thus employed at the mill.

Questions:
1. Based on what these investigations reveal, how would you describe work in the factories and mines? Consider hours, food, work conditions, discipline, regulations, etc.
2. What elements do you think particularly troubled the educated, middle-class investigators? Why?
22.3 Women Miners

One of the most prominent symbols of English industrialization was the Welsh coal mine. Lesser known, however, was the fact that women miners were a common site.


In England, exclusive of Wales, it is only in some of the colliery districts of Yorkshire and Lancashire that female Children of tender age and young and adult women are allowed to descend into the coal mines and regularly to perform the same kinds of underground work, and to work for the same number of hours, as boys and men; but in the East of Scotland their employment in the pits is general; and in South Wales it is not uncommon.

West Riding of Yorkshire: Southern Part.—In many of the collieries in this district, as far as relates to the underground employment, there is no distinction of sex, but the labour is distributed indifferently among both sexes, except that it is comparatively rare for the women to hew or get the coals, although there are numerous instances in which they regularly perform even this work. In great numbers of the coalpits in this district the men work in a state of perfect nakedness, and are in this state assisted in their labour by females of all ages, from girls of six years old to women of twenty-one, these females being themselves quite naked down to the waist.

“Girls,” says the Sub-Commissioner [J. C. Symons], “regularly perform all the various offices of trapping, hurrying [Yorkshire terms for drawing the loaded coal corves], filling, riddling, tipping, and occasionally getting, just as they are performed by boys. One of the most disgusting sights I have ever seen was that of young females, dressed like boys in trousers, crawling on all fours, with belts round their waists and chains passing between their legs, at day pits at Huns- shelf Bank, and in many small pits near Holmfirth and New Mills: it exists also in several other places. I visited the Huns- shelf Colliery on the 18th of January: it is a day pit; that is, there is no shaft or descent; the gate or entrance is at the side of a bank, and nearly horizontal. The gate was not more than a yard high, and in some places not above 2 feet.

“When I arrived at the board or workings of the pit I found at one of the sideboards down a narrow passage a girl of fourteen years of age in boy’s clothes, picking down the coal with the regular pick used by the men. She was half sitting half lying at her work, and said she found it tired her very much, and ‘of course she didn’t like it.’ The place where she was at work was not 2 feet high. Further on were men lying on their sides and getting. No less than six girls out of eighteen men and children are employed in this pit.

Whilst I was in the pit the Rev Mr Bruce, of Wadsley, and the Rev Mr Nelson, of Rotherham, who accompanied me, and remained outside, saw another girl of ten years of age, also dressed in boy’s clothes, who was employed in hurrying, and these gentlemen saw her at work. She was a nice-looking little child, but of course as black as a tinker, and with a little necklace round her throat.

“In two other pits in the Huddersfield Union I have seen the same sight. In one near New Mills, the chain, passing high up between the legs of two of these girls, had worn large holes in their trousers; and any sight more disgustingly indecent or revolting can scarcely be imagined than these girls at work—no brothel can beat it.

“On descending Messrs Hopwood’s pit at Barnsley, I found assembled round a fire a group of men, boys, and girls, some of whom were of the age of puberty; the girls as well as the boys stark naked down to the waist, their hair bound up with a tight cap, and trousers supported by their hips. (At Silkstone and at Flockton they work in their shifts and trousers.) Their sex was recognizable only by their breasts, and some little difficulty occasionally arose in pointing out to me which were girls and which were boys, and which caused a good deal of laughing and joking. In the Flockton and Thornhill pits the system is even more indecent; for though the girls are clothed, at least three-fourths of the men for whom they “hurry” work stark naked, or with a flannel waistcoat only, and in this state they assist one another to fill the corves 18 or 20 times a day: I have seen this done myself frequently.

“When it is remembered that these girls hurry chiefly for men who are not their parents; that they go from 15 to 20 times a day into a dark chamber (the bank face), which is often 50 yards apart from any one, to a man working naked, or next to naked, it is not to be supposed but that where opportunity thus prevails sexual vices are of common occurrence.

---

1 These were baskets to carry the hewn coal.
2 Sifting and separating of the coal.
Add to this the free intercourse, and the rendezvous at the shaft or bullstake, where the corves are brought, and consider the language to which the young ear is habituated, the absence of religious instruction, and the early age at which contamination begins, and you will have before you, in the coal-pits where females are employed, the picture of a nursery for juvenile vice which you will go far and we above ground to equal.”

Two Women Miners

Betty Harris, age 37: I was married at 23, and went into a colliery when I was married. I used to weave when about 12 years old; can neither read nor write. I work for Andrew Knowles, of Little Bolton (Lancs), and make sometimes 7s a week, sometimes not so much. I am a drawer, and work from 6 in the morning to 6 at night. Stop about an hour at noon to eat my dinner; have bread and butter for dinner; I get no drink. I have two children, but they are too young to work. I worked at drawing when I was in the family way. I know a woman who has gone home and washed herself, taken to her bed, delivered of a child, and gone to work again under the week.

I have a belt round my waist, and a chain passing between my legs, and I go on my hands and feet. The road is very steep, and we have to hold by a rope; and when there is no rope, by anything we can catch hold of. There are six women and about six boys and girls in the pit I work in; it is very hard work for a woman. The pit is very wet where I work, and the water comes over our clog-tops always, and I have seen it up to my thighs; it rains in at the roof terribly. My clothes are wet through almost all day long. I never was ill in my life, but when I was lying in.

My cousin looks after my children in the day time. I am very tired when I get home at night; I fall asleep sometimes before I get washed. I am not so strong as I was, and cannot stand my work so well as I used to. I have drawn till I have hathe skin off me; the belt and chain is worse when we are in the family way. My feller (husband) has beaten me many a times for not being ready. I were not used to it at first, and he had little patience.

I have known many a man beat his drawer. I have known men take liberties with the drawers, and some of the women have bastards.

Patience Kershaw, age 17, Halifax: I go to pit at 5 o’clock in the morning and come out at 5 in the evening; I get my breakfast, porridge and milk, first; I take my dinner with me, a cake, and eat it as I go; I do not stop or rest at any time for the purpose, I get nothing else until I get home, and then have potatoes and meat, not every day meat.

Questions:
1. Based on what these investigations reveal, how would you describe work in the factories and mines? Consider hours, food, work conditions, discipline, regulations, etc.
2. What elements do you think particularly troubled the educated, middle-class investigators? Why?
22.4 A Factory Girl: Countering the Stereotypes

Adelheid Popp (1869–1939) was the fifteenth child of weavers. Her alcoholic father died young, and she went to work early. At age 16, she became a social-democrat and in time became the editor of Working Women’s News in Austria and an important member of the social-democratic party. In 1909, she published her autobiography in order to inspire other working-class women and to inform the middle classes about working conditions.


FINDING WORK

It was a cold, severe winter, and the wind and snow could come unhindered into our room. In the morning when we opened the door we first had to hack away the ice on it in order to get out, because the entrance to our room was directly on the courtyard, and we had only a single glass door. My mother left the house at five-thirty because she had to start work at six. An hour later I went out to look for work. “Please, I need a job”—it had to be repeated countless times. I used to be on the street for almost the whole day. We couldn’t heat our room—that would have been extravagant—so I wandered around the streets, into churches, and to the cemetery. I took along a piece of bread and a few kreuzers to buy myself something at noon. I always had to hold back the tears forcibly when my request for work was denied and I had to leave the warm room. How gladly I would have done any work, just so I wouldn’t have to freeze. My clothes got wet in the snow, and my limbs were stiff from the hours of walking around. What’s more, my mother was getting more and more resentful. My brother had found work; snow had fallen, so he was busy*—of course the pay was so low that he could hardly support himself. I was the only one still without work.

I couldn’t even get work in the candy factories, where I had assumed they would need more help at Christmas-time. Today I know that almost all of the Christmas work is done several weeks before the holidays; the factory women have to work day and night for weeks, and then right before the holidays they are dismissed without consideration. At that time I still had no idea how the production process was carried out. How piously and faithfully I used to pray for work in church. I sought out the most celebrated saints. I went from altar to altar, kneeled down on the cold stones, and prayed to the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, the Queen of Heaven, and many other saints who were said to have special power and compassion.

My new workplace was on the third floor of a building that was used exclusively for industrial purposes. Not having known the bustle of a factory, I had never felt so uncomfortable. Everything displeased me—the dirty, sticky work; the unpleasant glass dust; the crowd of people; the crude tone; and the whole way that the girls and even married women behaved.

The owner’s wife—the “gracious lady,” as she was called—was the actual manager of the factory, and she talked just like the girls. She was a nice-looking woman, but she drank brandy, took snuff, and made unseemly rude jokes with the workmen. The owner was very ill, and when he came himself, there was always a violent scene. I pitied him. He seemed to me to be so good and noble, and I gathered from the behavior and whole manner of his wife that he must be unhappy. At his instructions I received a different, much more pleasant job. Up to then my job had been to hang the papers, which were smeared with glue and sprinkled with glass, onto lines strung rather high across the workroom. This work exhausted me greatly, and the owner must have noticed that it wasn’t suitable for me, because he instructed that from then on I was to keep count of the papers that were ready for processing. This work was clean and I liked it a lot better. Of course when there wasn’t anything to count, I had to do other kinds of work.

They often spoke of a Herr Berger, who was the company’s traveling representative and was expected back about then. All the women raved about him, so I was curious to see the man. I had been there for two weeks when he came. Everything was in a dither, and the only talk was of the looks of the traveler they so admired. Accompanied by the owner’s wife, he came into the room where I worked. I didn’t like him at all. That afternoon I was called into his office; Herr Berger sent me on an errand and made a silly remark about my “beautiful hands.” It was already dark when I returned; I had to pass through an empty anteroom that wasn’t lighted; it was half-dark since it got light only through the glass door leading into the workroom. Herr Berger was in the anteroom when I came. He took me by the hand and inquired sympathetically...
about my circumstances. I answered him truthfully and told of our poverty. He spoke a few words, taking pity on me and promising to use his influence to get me higher wages. Of course I was delighted with the prospect opening up to me, for I was getting only two and a half guilders a week, for which I had to work twelve hours a day. I stammered a few words of thanks and assured him that I would prove myself worthy of his solicitude. Before I even knew what was happening, Herr Berger had kissed me. He tried to calm my fright with the words, “It was just a fatherly kiss.” He was twenty-six years old, and I was almost fifteen, so fatherliness was out of the question.

Beside myself, I hurried back to my work. I didn’t know how I should interpret the incident; I thought the kiss was disgraceful, but Herr Berger had spoken so sympathetically and had held out the prospect of higher wages! At home I did tell of the promise, but I said nothing about the kiss because I was ashamed to talk about it in front of my brother. But my mother and brother were happy that I had found such an influential protector.

The next day I was overwhelmed with reproaches from one of my coworkers, a young blond girl whom I liked most of all. She reproached me for having taken her place with the traveler; up to now, if he had something to do or an errand to run, she had done it; he loved her, she protested through tears and sobs, and now I’d put an end to everything. The other girls joined in too; they called me a hypocrite, and the gracious lady herself asked me how I’d liked the kisses of the “handsome traveler.” The incident of the previous evening had been observed through the glass door, and they interpreted it in a way very insulting to me.

I was defenseless against their taunts and sneers and longed for the hour when I could go home. It was Saturday, and when I received my wages, I went home with the intention of not returning on Monday.

When I spoke of the matter at home, I was severely scolded. It was strange. My mother, who was always so intent on raising me to be a respectable girl, who always gave me instructions and warnings not to talk to men (“You should only allow yourself to be kissed by the man you’re going to marry,” she used to impress upon me)—in this instance my mother was against me. She said I was going too far. A kiss was nothing bad, and if I was getting more wages as a result, then it would be silly to give up my job. In the end she held my books responsible for my “overexcitement.” My mother got so mad about my “pigheadedness” that all the splendid things I’d been lent—The Book for Everyone [Das Buch für Alle], Over Land and Sea [Über Land und Meer], and Chronicle of the Times [Chronik der Zeit] (that’s how far advanced I was in literature)—were thrown out the door.* I collected them all again, but I didn’t dare read in the evening, although I’d usually been allowed to read longer on Saturdays.

That was a sad Sunday! I was depressed, and what’s more I was scolded the whole day.

On Monday my mother awakened me as usual and impressed upon me as she left for work not to do anything stupid, but rather to remember that in a few days it would be Christmas.

I went out intending to control myself and go to the factory; I got as far as the door and then I turned around. I had such a dreadful fear of unknown dangers that I preferred to go hungry than to suffer disgrace. Everything that had happened—the kiss and the reproaches of my coworkers—seemed a disgrace to me. Besides, I had been told that one of the girls always enjoyed the traveler’s special favor. But he was changeable; if a new girl came who pleased him more, then she would take the place of the previous one. All indications were that I had been chosen as the new favorite. That scared me a lot. I’d read so much in books about seduction and fallen virtue that I imagined the most hideous things happening. So I didn’t go in.

... ...

[She eventually found a factory job paying 4 guilders a week. After six months, pay was raised to 5 guilders.]

It seemed to me that I was almost rich. I figured out how much I’d be able to save over a few years, and I built castles in the air. Since I was used to extraordinary deprivations, I would have considered it extravagant to spend more now on food. As long as I didn’t feel hungry I didn’t take into account what I was eating. All I wanted was to dress nicely. When I went to church on Sunday no one should recognize me as a factory girl; I was ashamed of my work. Working in a factory always seemed to me to be degrading. When I was still an apprentice, I’d often heard it said that factory girls were bad, loose, and spoiled.* They were spoken of in the most insulting words, and I too had picked up this false notion. Now I myself was employed in a factory where there were so many girls.

The girls were friendly; they instructed me in my work in the most amiable manner, and they introduced me to the customs of the business. The girls in the sorting room were considered the elite of the personnel. The owner himself chose them, whereas the hiring for the machine room was left to the foremen. Men and women were together in the other rooms; but in my room there were only female employees. Men were used as extra help only when the heavy packages of sorted, counted, and labeled goods were moved to the courtyard.

... ...

In general, the only girls who ate well were those supported by their families. But there were only a few of them. More often the working girls had to support their parents or pay for baby-sitting for their children. How self-sacrificing these
mothers were! They saved kreuzer after kreuzer to better the lot of their children and to enable them to make gifts to the baby-sitter so that she would take good care of the children. Many women often had to provide for their unemployed husbands; they underwent double deprivation because they had to meet the household expenses alone. I also got to know the much-maligned frivolousness of factory girls. To be sure, the girls went dancing and they had love affairs; others stood in line at a theater at three o’clock in the afternoon so that they could see an evening performance for thirty kreuzers. In the summer they went on outings and walked for hours in order to save a couple of kreuzers of tram fare. For a few breaths of country air they had to pay with days of tired feet. If you want you can call all that frivolity, or even pleasure-seeking or debauchery, but who would dare to?

I saw among my coworkers—the despised factory women-examples of the most extraordinary sacrifices for others. If there was a special emergency in one family, then they chipped in their kreuzers to help. Even though they had worked twelve hours in the factory and many still had an hour’s walk home, they mended their own clothes, without ever having been taught how. They took apart their old dresses to fashion new ones from the separate pieces, which they sewed at night and on Sundays.

“A good boss”—that was the general opinion of our employer. But in the case of this very factory owner, one can see how profitable is the exploitation of human labor. He, who really did grant his workers more than most other entrepreneurs; he, who would continue for weeks to pay the wages of men and women who were sick; he, who in case of a death made a considerable contribution to the survivors; and he, who almost never rejected a request if someone turned to him in need— despite all this, he had gotten rich through the productive labor of the men and women working in his factory.

**Question:**
1. If you had been a worker in the nineteenth century, what would work have been like for you? Consider hours, conditions, types of work, relations with other classes, family life, etc.
22.5 A View from Downstairs: A Servant’s Life

Doris Viersbeck, born around 1869 in a small village, moved to the city of Hamburg in 1888, where she found work as a servant. The overwork and abuse Viersbeck describes, while seemingly extreme, were quite common, though of course, experiences varied from family to family. Viersbeck’s autobiography, published in 1910, was written in response to Popp’s autobiography (Document 22.3).


LIFE DOWNSTAIRS

In this house they kept a manservant to attend to the master; the women had told me about that when I’d been introduced to them. I say the women—there was an old lady (the gentleman’s wife) and a younger woman, her daughter-in-law. Together they ran the household.

The maid, Käthe, was a small, slight, tired-looking girl with curly brown locks on her head. I pitied her and asked whether she was tired. “Oh, yes,” she said, “you don’t get any rest here the whole day.” Exhausted, she sat down on a chair to eat her supper, but she barely had the first bite in her mouth when the bell rang. “One, two,” she counted and jumped up to go upstairs. The poor thing, I felt sorry for her; she seemed to be very young and was probably anemic too. She came right back down again with a little glass in her hand; it had been left upstairs. “Yes,” she complained, “that’s how it always is here; you have to climb the stairs for every little thing, and that makes me so tired.”

Nothing more was asked of me on this evening, but the poor little tired maid had to run upstairs several more times. I would have been happy to have done one of the trips for her, but I was a stranger and didn’t know the ways of the household. Finally, at about eleven-thirty, we could go to bed. My fellow worker was not very talkative and generally not especially friendly to me. I didn’t blame her for it; it was most likely due to exhaustion. I didn’t ask any more questions; I’d already seen and heard enough to give me something to think about. Anyone who is or has been in service can sympathize with me about how unpleasant the first day with new employers is.

The next morning I had to prepare coffee for the household. Käthe showed me a full coffee can and said, “Just make it real strong, that’s the way they’re used to it.” Well, I was all ready to do that, if only I could. But coffee drinking in this house wasn’t as simple as you’d think. In the dining room the table was set for two people; that was Käthe’s job. Then I had to prepare a tea tray for the master; Heinrich, the manservant, picked it up at seven o’clock. On the tea tray there had to be a full coffeepot, a little creamer, a little sugar bowl (of course also filled), a cup, and a plate of buttered rolls. The second, somewhat bigger, tea tray was picked up by Käthe a little later and carried upstairs for the two ladies. On this tray I had to put a coffeepot, a creamer, and a sugar bowl (all a bit larger than before), as well as two cups; instead of buttered rolls, there had to be a silver bread-basket with breakfast rolls and black bread, a butter cooler with butter, two plates, two knives. “Well, now that takes care of the third coffee service,” I thought. Things were really done differently here than at the Möllers.* I never saw or heard anything about coffee serving her.

The daughter-in-law’s two daughters, a girl of eighteen and a younger one of twelve, drank coffee in the dining room. The latter had to go to school; otherwise, as Käthe told me, she would have preferred to drink her coffee in bed—comfort loving and lazy as she was. Käthe spoke with respect and admiration only of the eighteen-year-old girl. The way she came to us in the kitchen that day took my heart by storm too. Her manner was simple and elegant. She bade us a friendly good morning and said truthfully that she had just come down to see the new cook. At this she nodded to me. She had wonderful blond hair, a peaches-and-cream complexion, fresh red lips, and splendid violet eyes. I had never seen so much beauty in one face. She asked me if I minded if she helped with the cooking now and then—she so much wanted to learn to cook. I said it was OK, and she left, saying, “Grandma and Mama will be right down.”

And so they were. These ladies were nice to me too. The younger lady had a basket of keys, and Frau Sparr a cookbook. I could tell right off that they weren’t as stingy as the Möllers. They almost always had dessert—Frau Sparr had told me about that when she’d hired me. I had told her that I didn’t have any experience with desserts because the Möllers rarely had such delicacies, but that I really wanted to learn. That’s why she brought along the cookbook. “There are a lot of nice recipes in this book,” she told me. “When you can make all of them, you’ll be a perfect cook. For today they picked...
a cold pudding that was easy to prepare. “Read through the recipe a few times so you know how it’s done; we always like to take the cookbook right back upstairs,” she said. That was too bad; I thought it would be at my disposal. I could do without it for today, but that might not always be true.

“... ... ... ... ... ... 

“... ... ... ... ... ... 

There was plenty of good food here; in fact, eating and drinking seemed to be the main activity. They had to have a hot breakfast at eleven o’clock even though they ate dinner at three o’clock. Of course this was my responsibility, and I also had a great deal of housework to do, so that it sometimes looked impossible to get everything done. The worst thing was that they never left us in peace to do our work. Ten times or more you were called away to do this or that, and then afterward they wondered why we were so far behind in our work. For example, every morning I had to take the big twelve-year-old girl to the streetcar ten minutes away from the house, because the little miss found going by herself so “boring”; she really would have liked to have had us pick her up too, but no one could get away at that time.

... ... ... ... ... ... 

The manservant was a cheerful twenty-three-year-old young man. The previous fall he had been discharged from the military where he’d been with the Wandsbeck hussars; he told us a lot of funny stories, and that helped get us through a lot. But he only occasionally had work downstairs because the master took up most of his time.

... ... ... ... ... ... 

The master didn’t give us any peace down in the basement either. There was a hand bell over his bed that rang downstairs; it was there for him to use when he woke up at noon in order to call the manservant if he happened to be downstairs at the time. Sometimes he’d ring the bell constantly during the night. I complained to Frau Sparr about it and asked her to disconnect the bell for the night because we needed to get some sleep. It was always late enough anyway before we could get to bed, never before twelve and often not till twelve-thirty or one o’clock. But what did she reply to me? “What are you talking about? The bell is there to be rung, not to be turned off. If the master rings he has some wishes, and they must be respected at all times.” I replied that’s why he had the manservant sleeping in his room, and he had a bell on his nightstand to wake him. “Well, he can’t find it sometimes,” she said. “Don’t make such a fuss about it.”

The lady was always very crude in the way she spoke; she seemed to have no education at all, and she had an evil tongue. Her sarcastic talk and false suspicions could drive a person to despair. Shortly after this she ordered me to make a fresh cup of coffee for the master every night at two o’clock; he didn’t like the cold coffee, and reheated coffee was even worse.

... ... ... ... ... ... 

I did it for two weeks and then I went on strike. When I complained that in the long run I just couldn’t hold up if I got so little sleep, she replied, “You’re big and fat, you’ll hold up. I want it this way and the master prefers to have fresh coffee.”

... ... ... ... ... ... 

On this evening I told the manservant that I couldn’t get up to bring up fresh coffee; I asked if he would be so good as to take the little alcohol stove upstairs with him so he could heat up the master’s coffee. He thought I was really right in finally revolting against this abuse, as he called it. Because it really wasn’t the master who’d demanded to have hot or fresh coffee; the “old lady” had just talked him into it.

... ... ... ... ... ... 

The master had said that you really couldn’t demand that. “Nonsense,” she’d said, “what do you pay servants for?”

... ... ... ... ... ... 

My face flushed; did one have to put up with everything from this uncouth woman just because she was rich and I was poor? And again I thought, “Oh, if you could just get out of this house forever!” There was no end to her scolding and abuse, but I was able to say to her very calmly: “Fine, Frau Sparr, don’t get excited on my account. I’m leaving my job today, I’ll straighten up the kitchen and then I’ll go.

She burst out laughing and said, “There are ways to get obstinate servants back to their work, I’ll just show you how we deal with them.”

“Do with me what you want, but I’m not staying,” I told her.
“You’ll stay because I wouldn’t give you a groschen of your wages, and without money you won’t get anywhere,” she replied.

“OK, fine, keep my quarterly wage.”

The daughter-in-law was called down, and they discussed it loudly enough that I could hear everything. She wanted to get a policeman, who could surely force me to stay, because there certainly was no law allowing servants simply to leave their employers in the lurch whenever they pleased. I couldn’t hear what her daughter-in-law said. With horror I thought to myself: If they can force you to stay, what then? I didn’t know the laws that well, and then suddenly it hit me: “Then you’ll drown yourself! Just so you don’t have to stay here any longer.”

...  ...

In the meantime the manservant had whispered to me, “If you give up your wages, nobody can force you to stay.” I got my courage back.

In a moment Frau Sparr came back down with a reasonably tolerable expression on her face and said to me: “Let’s make up, OK? You’re actually right, we can easily arrange for you to go out today. Go ahead, and everything will be as it was. I know you well enough to know that you wouldn’t cause me so much embarrassment. You’re such a good, dear girl.” With these last words she even stroked my cheeks.

“Serpent!” I thought. I said aloud, “Oh, no, this time I’m not being good, I’m going.”

Seeing that her efforts were in vain, she started the abuse again and said, “You act as if you were in a hell.”

“Well,” I said, “it can’t be much worse in hell with the devil.”

Käthe slipped back upstairs; Frau Sparr had forbidden her to speak to me. In a few moments the manservant came to the door with the request that I was to figure out exactly, down to the last pfennig, how much was owed me once the quarterly wage was deducted; Frau Sparr wanted nothing more to do with my affairs. I told the manservant that that wouldn’t be necessary; I was due so many marks and so many groschen, and I’d give her the small change along with the quarterly wage. A little while later he came back to tell me that I was supposed to get the money myself upstairs. When I’d gotten all my things ready to go, I went upstairs. Oh my, what grumpy faces I saw! Even the old man, who’d always been so friendly to me, followed me with nasty looks. There was a paper lying on the table next to the money. Frau Sparr pointed to it imperiously and said, “Please, sign that!”

“I won’t sign anything I haven’t read,” I said.

“Then, please, please,” she said with cutting scorn, “if you can read at all.”

“Maybe better than you,” I said, not wanting her to get the better of me. I read: “The undersigned herewith acknowledges to have broken a contract.” I told her, “I’ll sign this scrap of paper only if you add ‘for which she has given up her quarterly wage.’”

“I won’t think of it,” she yelled at me, “and if you don’t sign it I won’t give you this money either.”

“Good,” I replied, “I’ll find justice yet.”

With that I was about to go. But the daughter-in-law and the old man said, “She can ask for that, just write it so we’re done with the whole thing.” Cursing and scolding, she wrote it, and I put my name on this ridiculous document, pocketed what little money there was, and left the unfriendly house forever.

**Question:**
1. If you had been a worker in the nineteenth century, what would work have been like for you? Consider hours, conditions, types of work, relations with other classes, family life, etc.
22.6 Improving the Poor?

Hannah More (1745–1833), a member of the Blue Stockings, a London literary and conversational salon, started the Sunday School Movement and was active in the anti-slavery movement. In 1795–98, she attempted to counter both the revolutionary fervor of France and the supposed immorality of workers by publishing pamphlets and broadsides (posters); she wrote more than 50 herself, including "The Carpenter." They mimicked the style and form of the bawdy tales read and sung in alehouses. Two million copies were sold at 1/4 or 1 penny each to workers and to middle-class charitable societies who distributed them to the poor.

One blooming babe was all he had,
    His only darling dear.
The object of their equal love,
    The folace of their care.

O what cou’d ruin fuch a life,
    And fpoil fo fair a lot?
O what cou’d change fo kind a heart,
    All goodnefs quite forgot?

With grief the caufe muft relate,
    The difmal caufe reveal,
’Twas evil company and drink,
    The fource of every ill.

A Cooper came to live hard by,
    Who did his fancy pleafe;
And idle rambling Man was he,
    Who oft had crofs’d the feas.

This Man could tell a merry tale,
    And fing a merry fong;
And thofe who heard him fing or talk,
    Ne’er thought the ev’ning long.

But vain and vicious was the fong,
    And wicked was the tale;
And every paufe he always fill’d,
    With cider, gin, or ale.

Our Carpenter delighted much,
    To hear the Cooper talk;
And with him to the Ale-houfe oft,
    Wou’d take his evening walk.

At firft he did not care for drink,
    But only lik’d the fun;
Butfoon he from the Cooper learnt,
    The fame fad courfe to run.

He faid the Cooper’s company,
    Was all for which he car’d;
Butfoon he drank as much as he,
    To fwear like him foon dar’d.

His hammer now neglected lay,
    For work he little car’d;
Half finifh’d wheels, and broken tools,
    Were ftrew’d about his yard.

To get him to attend his work,
    No prayers cou’d now prevail:
His hatchet and his plane forgot,
    He never drove a Nail.
His cheer’full ev’nings now no more,  
With peace and plenty fmil’d;  
No more he fought his pleafing Wife,  
Nor hugg’d his fmiling child.

For not his drunken nights alone,  
Were with the Cooper paft;  
His days were at the Angel fpent,  
And ftil he flay’d the laft.

No handfome Sunday fuit was left,  
Nor decent holland fhirt;  
No nofegay mark’d the Sabbath day,  
But all was rags and dirt.

No more his Church he did frequent,  
A fymptom ever fad;  
Where once the Sunday is mifpent,  
The week days muft be bad.

The cottage mortgag’d for its worth,  
The favourite orchard fold;  
He foon began to feel th’effects  
Of hunger and of cold.

The pewter difhes one by one,  
Were pawn’d, till none was left;  
And wife and babe at home remain’d  
Of every help bereft.

By chance he call’d at home one night,  
And in a furly mood,  
He bade his weeping wife to get  
Immediately fome food.

His empty cupboard well he knew  
Muft needs be bare of bread;  
No rafher on the rack he faw,  
Whence cou’d he then be fed?

Hiw wife a piteous figh did heave,  
And then before he laid  
A bafket cover’d with a cloth,  
But not a word fhe faid.

Then to her hufband gave a knife,  
With many a filent tear;  
In hafte he tore the cover off,  
And faw his child lay there.

“There lies thy babe, the mother faid,  
“Opprefs’d with famine fore;  
“O kill us both—’twere kinder far,  
“We cou’d not fuffer more.”
The Carpenter, struck to the heart,
    Fell on his knees straightway;
He wrung his hands—confess’d his sins,
    And did both weep and pray.

From that same hour the Cooper more,
    He never would behold;
Nor would he to the Ale-house go,
    Had it been pave’d with gold.

His Wife forgave him all the past,
    And soothe’d his sorrowing mind,
And much he grieve’d that ever he wrong’d
    The worthiest of her kind.

By laboring hard, and working late,
    By industry and pains,
His Cottage was at length redeem’d,
    And save’d were all his gains.

His Sundays now at Church were spent,
    His home was his delight,
The following verse himself he made,
    And read it every night:

*The Drunkard Murders Child and Wife,*
    Nor matters it a pin,
*Where he stabs them with his knife,*
    *Or starves them by his gin.*

**Questions:**
1. What is the basic plot of the story?
2. What is the moral?
3. What does this tale reveal about working-class life or at least about middle-class perceptions of working-class life?
23.1 The Church Weighs In: Rerum Novarum

23.1a. In 1891, the Pope Leo XIII issued the Catholic Church’s response to industrialization, poor worker conditions, and revolutionary ideologies in the *Rerum Novarum (Of New Things)*. The *Rerum Novarum* became a principle document guiding the Church long into the twentieth century.


**PROPERTY**

The possession of private property is a right given to man by nature.... There is no reason why the directing power of the state should be brought in; for man is prior to the state, and therefore he must have had by nature the right to preserve his life and person before any community was organized.... The necessary materials for the preservation of life are lavishly supplied by the earth; but the earth could not supply them to itself without man’s cultivation, and since man applies the activity of his mind and the strength of his body in the production of the good things of nature, it follows that he claims for himself the portion of physical nature which he has himself tended, which he has in a sense stamped with his own personal impress. And so it should be altogether right for that portion to be possessed by him as his personal property; nor should anyone be allowed to violate that right in any way.... The force of these arguments is so obvious that it seems strange that they are opposed by some people who seek to re-establish worn-out doctrines; who allow individuals the use of the soil and the different products of lands, but say that it is not right that a man should possess, as an owner, the land on which he has built, or the estate which he has cultivated....

**WAGES**

Man’s labour has two inherent natural characteristics; it is *personal*, since the active force is attached to a person, and is completely the personal possession of the man by whom it is exercised, and is by nature designed for his advantage: and secondly, it is *necessary*, for this reason, that man requires the fruit of his labour for the preservation of his life, and the duty of self-preservation is grounded in the natural order. It follows that if we consider merely the *personal* aspect there is no doubt that it is open to the worker to reduce the agreed wage to narrow dimensions. He gives his services of his free will, and he can, of free will, content himself with a slender reward, or even with none at all. But a very different conclusion is reached when we combined the *necessary* with the *personal* element, and indeed they are only separable in thought, not in reality. To remain alive is a duty incumbent on all alike, in fact, and to fail in this duty is a crime. Hence arises of necessity the right of acquiring the materials for the support of life; and it is only by the wage earned with their labour that the lower orders are supplied with these means. Therefore the worker and the employer should freely come to agreement, especially in regard to the level of wages.... But there is an underlying condition which arises from natural laws, namely that the wage should be sufficient to support the worker, provided he is thrifty and well behaved. If the worker is compelled to accept harsher terms, or is induced to do so by fear of worse hardships, and these have to be accepted because they are imposed by a master or employer, this is submission to force and therefore repugnant to justice.... If the worker receives sufficient payment to maintain himself, his wife, and his children, in comfort, he will be ready to practise thrift, if he is sensible, and will follow the prompting of nature by reducing his expenditure to ensure some surplus by means of which he may attain a modest property.... The right of private property ought to be inviolate.... For the attainment of these advantages it is an essential condition that private property should not be exhausted by inordinate taxation. The right of personal possessions is not based on human law; it is given by nature. Therefore public authority cannot abolish it; it can only control its use and adjust it to the common good.

**TRADES UNIONS**

That men should commonly unite in associations of this kind [trades unions and the like], whether made up wholly of workers or of both classes together, is to be welcomed.... Natural law grants man the right to join particular associations, and the state is appointed to support natural law, not to destroy it.... and the state arises from the same principle which produces particular societies, the fact that men are by nature gregarious. But circumstances sometimes arise when it is right for the laws to check associations of this kind; this happens if ever these associations deliberately adopt aims which are in open conflict with honesty, with justice, and with the well-being of the community.
The second part of this excerpt comes from a 1931 encyclical in which the *Rerum Novarum* is interpreted in light of new conditions that had developed in the forty years since its publication.


*The Power of the State.* From the double character of ownership personal and social—it follows that in this matter men must take account not only of their own advantage but also of the common good. To define these duties in detail, when necessity demands, and natural law itself does not give guidance, belongs to those in authority in the State. Therefore public authority can decide more accurately what is permissible and what is forbidden to owners of property in the use of their possessions, in the consideration of the governing demands of the common good—always in the light of the teaching of natural and divine law. Indeed Leo XIII wisely taught that ‘the control of private possessions has been entrusted by God to the skill of men and the laws of nations’.... However, it is clear that the state is not permitted to exercise its prerogative in an arbitrary manner. For the natural right of private property and of hereditary transmission must be kept intact and inviolate as a right which the state cannot take away ‘because man is prior to the state’ and ‘the family is prior to the civil community in thought and in fact’. Hence the wisest of pontiffs laid it down that was utterly wrong for the state to exhaust private incomes by inordinate taxation. ‘The right of private property is given by nature, not by human law. Public authority has therefore merely the power of controlling its unjust and of adjusting it with the common good, it has no right to abolish it.’...

### CAPITAL AND LABOUR

[Capital and labour need each other]... Wealth which is continually increased by economic-social gains should be assigned to individuals and classes in such a way as to secure... the common good of the whole community. By this law of social justice it is forbidden that one class should exclude the other from sharing the profits. This law is violated when the rich... consider the just state of affairs to be that by which they receive all the profit and the workers receive none, and equally when the working class... claims that all things are the result of its manual labour, and therefore attacks and strives to abolish all ownership and all returns and profits which are not acquired by labour....

### THE JUST WAGE

*The Personal and Social Character of Labour*.... Unless the social and juridical order safeguards the exercise of labour... unless intelligence, money and labour are allied and united, the activity of man is unable to produce its proper results. If the social and personal nature of labour be disregarded it cannot be justly valued nor equitably recompensed.

### THREE PRINCIPLES

(a) The worker should receive a wage adequate for the support of himself and his family.... It is the worst of abuses... that mothers should be compelled, because of the inadequacy of the father’s wage, to earn money outside the home, to the neglect of their particular duties and responsibilities, especially the care of their children....

(b) In deciding the level of wages the condition of the productive organization must be taken into account. It is unjust to demand excessive payment which the business cannot stand without disaster to itself and subsequent ruin to its workers. But technical and economic inefficiency... is not to be considered an excuse for reducing wages....

(c) The level of wages must be adjusted to the public economic good.... Wages should be so regulated, as far as possible by consent, that as many as possible may be able to hire labour and receive suitable reward for their livelihood....

### THE RIGHT ORDER OF SOCIETY

*The State’s Responsibility*.... Public authority should delegate to subordinate bodies the task of dealing with problems of minor importance so that it may carry out... the duties peculiarly incumbent upon it... [of promoting the common good, regulating the ‘hierarchical order’ of these free associations of bodies autonomous in their economic and professional spheres, and encouraging a ‘harmony of orders’ in place of a ‘rivalry of classes’.]
**Part 23: Nineteenth-Century Society**

*The Governing Economic Principle...* The unity of human society cannot be based on the opposition of ‘classes’; the establishment of a right economic order cannot be left to a free trial of strength... economic power must be controlled by social justice and social charity....

[Changes since *Rerum Novarum*...]. There has been not merely accumulation of wealth but a huge concentration of power and economic dictatorship in the hands of a few who are for the most part not the owners but merely the trustees and administrators of investing property, handling such funds at their arbitrary pleasure.... This irresponsible power is the natural fruit of unlimited free competition which leaves surviving only the most powerful, which often means the most violent and unscrupulous fighters....

**SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM**

[Since *Rerum Novarum*, Socialism has divided into two parties.]

(a) *Communism...* Communism teaches the fiercest warfare between classes and aims at the total abolition of private ownership... shrinks from nothing in the pursuit of its aims... and when it seizes power it displays incredible cruelty and inhumanity... its open enmity to Holy Church and to God himself is, alas, all too clearly proved by its actions....

(b) *Socialism.* The other party, which keeps the name ‘Socialism’ is milder. It professes to abjure violence, and if it does not do away with class warfare and the abolition of private property, it does in some degree soften and ameliorate those conceptions.... One might say that socialism in some way approaches the truths which Christian tradition has always held.... But whether considered as a doctrine, or as a historical fact, or as an activity, socialism, while it remains truly socialism, cannot be harmonized with the dogmas of the Catholic Church, even after the concessions made to truth and justice.... The picture it draws of society is utterly remote from Christian truth. For the Christian teaching is that man, endowed with a social nature, is placed on this earth to live his life in society and under the authority ordained by God (cf. Rom. xiii. 1), and to cultivate and develop all his powers to the full for the praise and glory of his Creator, and by the faithful fulfillment of his duty in his craft or other vocation to attain both temporal and eternal happiness. While socialism neither knows nor cares anything at all about this sublime end of man and of society and considers that human fellowship is instituted solely for convenience.... ‘Religious socialism,’ ‘Christian socialism’ are contradictions; no-one can be at once a true Catholic and a socialist, in the proper meaning of the term....

**Questions:**
The following questions pertain to documents 23.1 and 23.2.
1. What do each of these solutions advocate?
2. How do each of these solutions differ from the programs implemented by the governments in power? What might explain these differences?
23.2 Women Without Power Change the System

In 1866–69, the British Parliament passed the Contagious Diseases Acts to regulate prostitution and reduce the incidence of sexual diseases particularly among the military forces. Josephine Butler, an upper-middle-class woman, was at the forefront of efforts to repeal these Acts, which occurred in 1886. The following letter from Butler to the International Convention of Women in Washington, D.C. (1888) reveals some of the repeal arguments and some of the international connections women had to work on political issues (even while they were formally banned from voting and engaging in politics).


March, 1888.

DEAR LADIES,

Being prevented by domestic circumstances from attending your assemblies personally, I am glad to entrust a few words of greeting to my dear and honored friend, Mrs. STEW AB, who has consented to cross the Atlantic, at my earnest request, as a delegate from our Ladies’ National Association. That Association was formed in the winter of 1869, having for its definite aim the obtaining of the repeal of the Acts of Parliament of 1866–69 for the State regulation of vice; or, in other words, for the provisioning of the army and navy (not in Great Britain alone, but in our Indian Empire and all our colonies) with selected and superintended and healthy women. “A celibate soldiery,” it was said by our heathen legislators of that day, “require such a provision as urgently and as regularly as they required daily rations.”

The Committee of our Ladies’ National Association strongly desired that a delegate should be selected from our midst, who had been associated in that work from any early period; and such an one is Mrs. Steward, who has been an indefatigable worker, not only in England, but in Belgium, in pursuit of and for the saving of the English-girl victims who were bought, stolen and destroyed under this diabolical system of State-protected vice in that country. There is now a crowd of younger workers who are bravely preaching the purity crusade and doing excellent vigilance work; while there are few of the veterans left who inaugurated in 1869 the fierce contest with our Government, the Houses of Lords and Commons, the Medical Boards, the Press, and the Upper Classes generally, in order to gain the abolition of the vice-protecting laws—and to assert the equality of the Moral Law for two sexes, as well as the dignity and sacredness of Womanhood. Among those veteran workers were included the names of Florence Nightingale, Harriet Martineau, Mary Somerville, Mary Carpenter and others. Some are gone to their rest; others are aged and worn, and waiting for their call home. Those who remain hold together and work together still, bound to each other by strong affection, and by the memory of past suffering and conflict shared together. Of this group Mrs. Steward is one, and I commend her to your sisterly kindness and hospitality.

Our Continental Secretary, Mr. Humbert, writing on this subject after fourteen years’ experience, says: “Happy are those nations in which women themselves have taken the initiative in this great movement, for in such cases the movement will never die; whereas in countries where the work is left entirely to men, although some reforms may be achieved, the movement is fitful and never possesses the same life.”

This brings to me the most recent expansion of our work in the Colonies and in India. It is in allusion to this new expansion that Mr. Humbert writes the letter just quoted. He continues, “How are we to proceed successfully for the emancipation of women from the hateful thraldom imposed on them by the civilization of conquering races, the thraldom of compulsory and state-regulated prostitution among Buddhists, Brahmans, Mahometans, or Pagans, where the fate of women, in this world, at least, depends absolutely on the will of man, their master? This is a difficult question to answer. We see occasionally a spark kindled amongst those nations; but the light is short lived, and it continually requires to be rekindled.” In spite of these difficulties, however, we are pushing forward our work in Egypt and in the French Colonies of North Africa, as well as in other directions.

We believe that the question is coming rapidly to the front in India. The present mission of Mr. Dyer to India is producing an awakening there that will be productive of very decided results from a Parliamentary and Governmental point of view. We, as women, are more especially concerned with the awakening of the women of India on the subject of this imperially-imposed degradation of their race, and to kindred questions vitally concerning womanhood. On this side we
are full of hope. It is affecting to see the petitions which are now in the hands of some of our Members of Parliament this session. These petitions are from Anglo-Indian and native women—and many are signed in Hindoo characters. The prayer of the petition is for relief from this degrading law. We receive also privately very touching appeals from Indian ladies, and to these our Association responds with eager sympathy.

Thus the women of the world are reaching out their hands to each other, and banding themselves together so that when councils, rulers, and lords of science endeavour by decrees or by social tyranny to give a continuance to the most degrading institution which has defiled the history of the human race, they will have the power to say, “You shall not slay us or our sisters.” They have struck a note for which the ages have been waiting, and which even the Church itself in its organized ecclesiastical forms has never yet intoned.

There is a point on which I have sometimes thought (possibly without reason) that American women feel less strongly than we do: I allude to the physical treatment forcibly imposed, the personal outrage on women, which lies at the root of the practical working of the whole system of the state regulation of vice. You have happily not had in America the practical experience which we in the old world have had of the degrading effects of this outrage. It is the final and most complete expression of the foul idea of woman as a chattel, a slave, an instrument, a mere vessel, officially dedicated to the vilest uses.

At our last International Congress, held at Lausanne, in September, 1887, some of our less-instructed followers had been occupying too much of our time in an attempt to defend, up to a certain point, the State’s action in tyrannizing over women. Thinking that the moment had come for a decided word on the part of women themselves, I gave utterance to the thoughts which were in my mind; and in doing so I proclaimed in the name of all women, that whatever subtlety of argument might weigh with certain doctors, legislators, etc., this was nothing to us, and we women solemnly declared again the principle of our own dignity, and our determination never to sanction the enslavement of any woman by the outrage perpetrated under this system. At the close of my few words Mdm. de Morsier, de Paris, rose, and with uplifted hand asked earnestly that every woman present who agreed with, and re-echoed from the depths of her heart the words of Mrs. Butler, should stand up. The large hall was crowded with women as well as men. The men continued sitting, but every woman rose, and with right hand uplifted high, followed the action of Mdm. de Morsier and Mdm. de Gingins, responding to the solemn words uttered by her—“In the name of God, Amen!” There was a significant silence of few moments. Some of the gentlemen were surprised; most were deeply moved; and to every woman present, I feel convinced, it was a ratification of our principles never to be forgotten. The sound of it went far abroad beyond the mere hall of meeting itself.

I mention this incident merely as an illustration of the spirit of our women in their jealous guardianship of the sacredness of womenhood, even in the persons of the most degraded of their sisters. I myself believe this spirit to be thoroughly in accord with that of our Master, Christ.

As an inevitable and necessary accompaniment of the establishment of licensed houses of ill-fame under Government patronage, all over the world there exists, as you well know, the most extensive slave traffic in the interests of vice. This fact has become so fully acknowledged during the last few years as to have given rise to that admirable and much-needed Society—the “International Association of Friends of Girls,”—originating in Switzerland and now spreading all over and far beyond Europe. That Society has been greatly strengthened in England since the Congress held in London in 1886; and this fact is brought home to us by the reassuring sight at various railway stations and landing places of the warnings and friendly placards, so diligently distributed and put up by the English branch of the Society, informing all girls and women of where they may find friends, and of what dangers they must beware.

Our Federation has collected carefully many facts and statistics concerning this world-wide slave traffic. People in Europe speak with indignation of the traffic in negroes. It would just as well if they would open their eyes to what is going on much nearer—throughout the whole of Europe—especially in Germany and Austria, where the exportation of white slaves is carried on on a large scale. A terrible picture is presented to us of the enforced movement to and fro upon the face of the earth of these youthful victims of human cruelty.

You in America are happily free from the state regulation of vice; but, undoubtedly there is an extensive traffic in white slaves in your midst, and a constant importation of poor foreigners to your shores, who are destined to moral and spiritual destruction. I trust you will, from your Congress, put out strong hands for the abolition of this traffic.

It may be that I am writing to some who have been accustomed to think of the poor outcasts of society as beings different from others—in some way tainted from their birth, creatures apart without the tenderness and capacities for good possessed by your own cherished daughters.

You may have imagined them to be for the most part reckless and willful sinners; or, if in the first instance betrayed or forced into sin, now at least so utterly destroyed and corrupted as to have become something unmentionable.
in polite society. Now, all who have had a practical acquaintance with the lives of poor and tempted women, know how mistaken is such a judgment, how cruelly false in most cases. But granting for the moment that women who have fallen from virtue have become so degraded as to be repulsive or uninteresting to you, what have you to say concerning outraged children?—And thousands of these are but children in age and in knowledge.

... 

This letter is sent forth with earnest prayer that while pardoning the imperfections of my poor appeal, God would make use of it to fan the holy and purifying fire, which I feel sure is already kindled in your hearts. When I kneel in my chamber to plead for the deliverance of these little ones for whom Christ died, I seem to see the childish faces gathering in crowds around me, filling the space on every side—the faces of the slaughtered dead as well as of the living. These victims, voiceless and unable to plead their own cause, seem to make their ceaseless, mute appeal from their scattered, unknown graves and from out those dark habitations of cruelty, where they are now helplessly imprisoned.

But their weeping has been heard in heaven, and judgment is at hand.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 23.1 and 23.2.
1. What do each of these solutions advocate?
2. How do each of these solutions differ from the programs implemented by the governments in power? What might explain these differences?
23.3 Sex in Society

Part of the Naturalist Movement, Emile Zola (1840–1902) followed the so-called scientific effects of heredity and environment on one family “Les Rougon-Macquart” in twenty novels, published in the early Third Republic (1871–1893). Nana, one of the best known, tells of the rise and fall of a courtesan, a high-class prostitute. The following excerpt introduces Nana and provides a fictionalized account of life in Paris during the Second Empire (1852–1870).


‘And what about Nana, the new star, who’s going to play Venus—do you know her?’
‘Oh, dear, here we go again!’ cried Fauchery, throwing up his hands. ‘Ever since this morning, everybody has been asking me about Nana. I’ve met over a score of people, and it’s been Nana here and Nana there. What do they expect me to tell them? Do I know all the girls in Paris?... Nana is something invented by Bordenave. I don’t need to say more than that.’

Downstairs, in the big marble-paved vestibule where the ticket-barrier was installed, the audience was beginning to arrive. Through the three open gates could be seen the vibrant life of the swarming boulevards, ablaze with light in the fine April night. The rumbling of carriages stopped short, doors slammed, and people entered in little groups, waiting at the barrier before climbing the double staircase behind, where the women, their hips swaying, lingered for a moment. In the crude gaslight, on the pale bare walls skimpily decorated in the Empire style to form a peristyle like a cardboard temple, tall yellow posters were boldly displayed with Nana’s name in thick black letters.

Some gentlemen were reading them, as if accosted on the way; others were standing about chatting together, blocking the doors; while near the box-office a thickset man with a broad, clean-shaven face was curtly rebuffing people who were pressing him to let them have seats.
‘There’s Bordenave,’ said Fauchery, coming down the staircase.
But the manager had already stopped him.
‘You’re a fine one!’ he called out to him from a distance. ‘So that’s how you write an article for me.... I opened the Figaro this morning. Not a thing.’

‘Now wait a minute!’ replied Fauchery. ‘I have to know this Nana of yours before I can talk about her.... Besides, I haven’t promised anything.’

Then to cut the conversation short, he introduced his cousin, Monsieur Hector de la Faloise, a young man who had come to Paris to complete his education. The manager weighed up the young man with a single glance, but Hector examined him with a certain emotion. So this was Bordenave, the notorious exhibitor of women who treated them like a slave-driver, the man who was forever hatching some new advertising scheme, shouting, spitting, slapping his thighs, a shameless character with a coarse sense of humour. Hector thought it incumbent on him to make a polite remark.
‘Your theatre...’ he began in a piping voice.
Bordenave calmly interrupted him with a vulgar correction, like a man who prefers to call a spade a spade.
‘You mean my brothel.’

Fauchery promptly gave an approving laugh, while la Faloise stood there with his compliment stuck in his throat, deeply shocked, but trying to look as if he appreciated the remark. The manager had rushed away to shake hands with a theatre critic whose notices had considerable influence. When he came back, la Faloise had almost recovered his composure. He was afraid of being dismissed as a provincial booby if he showed how taken aback he was.
‘They tell me,’ he started again, determined to find something to say, ‘that Nana has a delightful voice.’
‘That girl?’ exclaimed the manager, shrugging his shoulders. ‘Why, she’s tone-deaf!’
The young man hurriedly added:
‘At any rate, she’s an excellent actress.’
‘Her?... She’s a great lump of a girl! She doesn’t know what to do with her hands and feet.’
La Faloise blushed slightly. He no longer knew what to say. He stammered:
‘I wouldn’t have missed this premiere for anything. I knew that your theatre...’
‘You mean my brothel,’ Bordenave interrupted once more, with the cold obstinacy of a man of conviction.
Meanwhile Fauchery, who was perfectly collected, was looking at the women coming in. He came to his cousin’s rescue when he saw him gaping foolishly, not knowing whether to laugh or lose his temper.

‘Oh, do try to please Bordenave, and call his theatre whatever he likes, seeing that it amuses him.... As for you, my dear fellow, don’t you try to fool us. If this Nana of yours can’t sing or act, you’ll have a flop on your hands, that’s all. To tell the truth, that’s what I’m afraid is going to happen.’

‘A flop? A flop!’ shouted the manager, turning red in the face. ‘Does a woman need to be able to sing and act? Don’t be stupid, my boy,... Nana has something else, dammit, and something that takes the place of everything else. I scented it out, and it smells damnably strong in her, or else I’ve lost my sense of smell.... You’ll see, you’ll see; she’ll only have to appear and the whole audience will be hanging out their tongues.’

He had held up his big hands which were trembling with enthusiasm, and now, having relieved his feelings, he lowered his voice and muttered to himself:

‘Yes, she’ll go far! Oh, yes, so help me, she’ll go far!... A skin! Oh, what a skin she’s got!’

Then, as Fauchery began questioning him, he consented to go into details, using such crude expressions that Hector de la Faloise was embarrassed. He had got to know Nana and decided to put her on the stage. As it happened, he had been looking for a Venus at the time. He wasn’t the sort who let a woman encumber him for any length of time; he preferred to let the public have the benefit of her straight away. But he had a lot of trouble on his hands at his theatre, which had been turned topsy-turvy by the girl’s arrival. Rose Mignon, his star, a good actress and an adorable singer, was daily threatening to leave him in the lurch, for she was furious and guessed that she had a rival. As for the bill, good God, what a rumpus that had caused! In the end he had decided to print the names of the two actresses in the same-sized type. He didn’t like being pestered. Whenever one of his little women, as he called them—Simonne or Clarisse, for instance—didn’t toe the line, he just gave her a kick in the arse. Otherwise life was impossible. After all, he sold them and he knew what the little tarts were worth!

On the pavement outside, the row of gas-jets blazing along the cornice of the theatre cast a patch of brilliant light. Two small trees stood out sharply, a crude green colour, and a column shone white, so brightly lit that you could read the notices on it at a distance, as if in broad daylight, while the dense night of the boulevard beyond was dotted with lights above the vague mass of an ever-moving crowd. Many men were not entering the theatre straight away, but staying outside to chat while finishing their cigars under the line of gas-jets, which gave their faces a livid pallor and silhouetted their short black shadows on the asphalt.

‘Why didn’t you tell me that you knew Nana?’

‘Nana? I’ve never set eyes on her.’

‘Honestly? Somebody assured me you’d slept with her.’

[A man passed by:]

‘Nana’s fancy man.’

Everyone looked at him. He was a good-looking fellow. Fauchery recognized him: it was Daguenet, a young man who had thrown away three thousand francs on women, and was now playing the stock market in order to treat them to occasional bouquets and dinners.

Meanwhile the conductor raised his violin-bow and the orchestra launched into the overture. People were still coming in; the bustle and noise were on the increase. Among that unchanging audience peculiar to first nights, groups of old acquaintances gathered welcoming one another warmly. Old first-nighters, hat on head and perfectly at ease, kept exchanging greetings. The whole of Paris was there, the Paris of letters, of finance and of pleasure. There were a great many journalists, a few authors, a number of speculators and more courtesans than respectable women. It was a singularly mixed world, composed of all the talents, and tarnished by all the vices, a world where the same fatigue and the same fever appeared in every face.

Questions:
1. How is Nana described? What makes her such an attraction?
2. How does Zola describe Parisian society life? What elements dominate?
3. How does he describe the various characters? What is he suggesting about their roles in French society?
23.4 John Stuart Mill: from The Subjection of Women

John Stuart Mill (1806–1873) was a constant advocate of social and political reform. In his philosophical works he sought to modify utilitarianism, softening it by combining it with humanitarianism. As the document below attests, Mill was a strong supporter of women’s rights.


1. The object of this Essay is to explain, as clearly as I am able, the grounds of an opinion which I have held from the very earliest period when I had formed any opinions at all on social or political matters, and which, instead of being weakened or modified, has been constantly growing stronger by the progress of reflection and the experience of life: That the principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes—the legal subordination of one sex to the other—is wrong in itself, and now one of the chief hindrances to human improvement; and that it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side, nor disability on the other.

2. The very words necessary to express the task I have undertaken, show how arduous it is. But it would be a mistake to suppose that the difficulty of the case must lie in the insufficiency or obscurity of the grounds of reason on which my conviction rests. The difficulty is that which exists in all cases in which there is a mass of feeling to be contended against. So long as an opinion is strongly rooted in the feelings, it gains rather than loses in stability by leaving a preponderating weight of argument against it. For if it were accepted as a result of argument, the refutation of the argument might shake the solidity of the conviction; but when it rests solely on feeling, the worse it fares in argumentative contest, the more persuaded its adherents are that their feeling must have some deeper ground, which the arguments do not reach; and while the feeling remains, it is always throwing up fresh entrenchments of argument to repair any breach made in the old. And there are so many causes tending to make the feelings connected with this subject the most intense and most deeply-rooted of all those which gather round and protect old institutions and customs, that we need not wonder to find them as yet less undermined and loosened than any of the rest by the progress of the great modern spiritual and social transition; nor suppose that the barbarisms to which men cling longest must be less barbarisms than those which they earlier shake off.

3. In every respect the burthen is hard on those who attack an almost universal opinion. They must be very fortunate as well as unusually capable if they obtain a hearing at all. They have more difficulty in obtaining a trial, than any other litigants have in getting a verdict. If they do extort a hearing, they are subjected to a set of logical requirements totally different from those exacted from other people. In all other cases, the burthen of proof is supposed to lie with the affirmatives. If a person is charged with a murder, it rests with those who accuse him to give proof of his guilt, not with himself to prove his innocence. If there is a difference of opinion about the reality of any alleged historical event, in which the feelings of men in general are not much interested, as the Siege of Troy for example, those who maintain that the event took place are expected to produce their proofs, before those who take the other side can be required to say anything; and at no time are these required to do more than show that the evidence produced by the others is of no value. Again, in practical matters, the burthen of proof is supposed to be with those who are against liberty; who contend for any restriction or prohibition; either any limitation of the general freedom of human action, or any disqualification or disparity of privilege affecting one person or kind of persons, as compared with others. The a priori presumption is in favour of freedom and impartiality. It is held that there should be no restraint not required by the general good, and that the law should be no respecter of persons, but should treat all alike, save where dissimilarity of treatment is required by positive reasons, either of justice or of policy. But of none of these rules of evidence will they benefit be allowed to those who maintain the opinion I profess. It is useless for me to say that those who maintain the doctrine that men have a right to command and women are under an obligation to obey, or that men are fit for government and women unfit, are on the affirmative side of the question, and that they are bound to show positive evidence for the assertions, or submit to their rejection. It is equally unavailing for me to say that those who deny to women any freedom or privilege rightly allowed to men, having the double presumption against them that they are opposing freedom and recommending partiality, must be held to the strictest proof of their case, and unless their success be such as to exclude all doubt, the judgment ought to go against them.

These would be thought good pleas in any common case; but they will not be thought so in this instance. Before I could hope to make any impression, I should be expected not only to answer all that has ever been said by those who take the other side of the question, but to imagine all that could be said by them—to find them in reasons, as well as answer all I find: and besides refuting all arguments for the affirmative, I shall be called upon for invincible positive arguments to prove a negative. And even if I could do all this, and leave the opposite party with a host of unanswered arguments against them, and not a single unrefuted one on their side, I should be thought to have done little; for a cause supported on the one hand by universal usage, and on the other by so great a preponderance of popular sentiment, is supposed to have a pre-
presumption in its favour, superior to any conviction which an appeal to reason has power to produce in any intellects but those of a high class.

4. I do not mention these difficulties to complain of them; first, because it would be useless; they are inseparable from having to contend through people’s understandings against the hostility of their feelings and practical tendencies: and truly the understanding of the majority of mankind would need to be much better cultivated than has ever yet been the case, before they can be asked to place such reliance in their own power of estimating arguments, as to give up practical principles in which they have been born and bred, and which are the basis of much of the existing order of the world, at the first argumentative attack which they are not capable of logically resisting. I do not therefore quarrel with them for having too little faith in argument, but for having too much faith in custom and the general feeling. It is one of the characteristic prejudices of the reaction of the nineteenth century against the eighteenth, to accord to the unreasoning elements in human nature the infallibility which the eighteenth century is supposed to have ascribed to the reasoning elements. For the apotheosis of Reason we have substituted that of Instinct; and we call everything instinct which we find in ourselves and for which we cannot trace any rational foundation. This idolatry, infinitely more degrading than the other, and the most pernicious of the false worships of the present day, of all of which it is now the main support, will probably hold its ground until it gives way before a sound psychology, laying bare the real root of much that is bowed down to as the intention of Nature and the ordinance of God. As regards the present question, I am willing to accept the unfavourable conditions which the prejudice assigns to me. I consent that established custom, and the general feeling, should be deemed conclusive against me, unless that custom and feeling from age to age can be shown to have owed their existence to other causes than their soundness, and to have derived their power from the worse rather than the better parts of human nature. I am willing that judgment should go against me, unless I can show that my judge has been tampered with. The concession is not so great as it might appear; for to prove this is by far the easiest portion of my task.

5. The generality of a practice is in some cases a strong presumption that it is, or at all events once was, conducive to laudable ends. This is the case, when the practice was first adopted, or afterwards kept up, as a means to such ends, and was grounded on experience of the mode in which they could be most effectually attained. If the authority of men over women, when first established, had been the result of a conscientious comparison between different modes of constituting the government of society; if, after trying various other modes of social organization—the government of women over men, equality between the two, and such mixed and divided modes of government as might be invented—it had been decided, on the testimony of experience, that the mode in which women are wholly under the rule of men, having no share at all in public concerns, and each in private being under the legal obligation of obedience to the man with whom she has associated her destiny, was the arrangement most conducive to the happiness and well-being of both; its general adoption might then be fairly thought to be some evidence that, at the time when it was adopted, it was the best: though even then the considerations which recommended it may, like so many other primeval social facts of the greatest importance, have subsequently, in the course of ages, ceased to exist. But the state of the case is in every respect the reverse of this. In the first place, the opinion in favour of the present system, which entirely subordinates the weaker sex to the stronger, rests upon theory only: for there never has been tried made of any other: so that experience, in the sense in which it is vulgarly opposed to theory, cannot be pretended to have pronounced any verdict. And in the second place, the adoption of this system of inequality never was the result of deliberation, or forethought, or any social ideas, or any notion whatever of what conduced to the benefit of humanity or the good order of society. It arose simply from the fact that from the very earliest twilight of human society, every woman (owing to the value attached to her by men, combined with her inferiority in muscular strength) was found in a state of bondage to some man. Laws and systems of polity always beg recognizing the relations they find already existing between individuals. They convert what was a mere physical fact into a legal right, give it the sanction of society, and principally aim at the substitution of public and organized means of asserting and protecting these rights, instead of the irregular and lawless conflict of physical strength. Those who had already been compelled to obedience became in this manner legally bound to it. Slavery, from being a mere affair of force between the master and the slave, became regularized and a matter of compact among the masters, who, binding themselves to one another for common protection, guaranteed by their collective strength the private possessions of each, including his slaves. In early times, the great majority of the male sex were slaves, as well as the whole of the female. And many ages elapsed, some of them ages of high cultivation, before any thinker was bold enough to question the rightfulness, and the absolute social necessity, either of the one slavery or of the other. By degrees such thinkers did arise: and (the general progress of society assisting) the slavery of the male sex has, in all the countries of Christian Europe at least (the general in one of them, only within the last few years), been at length abolished, and that of the female sex has been gradually changed into a milder form of dependence. But this dependence, as it exists at present, is not an original institution, taking a fresh start from considerations of justice and social expediency—it is the primitive state of slavery lasting on, through successive mitigations and modifications occasioned by the same causes which have softened the general manners, and brought all human relations more under the control of justice and the influence of humanity. It has not lost the taint of its brutal origin. No presumption in its favour, therefore, can be drawn from the fact of its existence. The only such presumption which it
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could be supposed to have, must be grounded on its having lasted till now, when so many other things which came down
from the same odious source have been done away with. And this, indeed, is what makes it strange to ordinary ears, to hear
it asserted that the inequality of rights between men and women has no other source than the law of the strongest.

That this statement should have the effect of a paradox is in some respects creditable to the progress of civili-
ization, and the improvement of the moral sentiments of mankind. We now live—that is to say, one or two of the most
advanced nations of the world now live—in a state in which the law of the strongest seems to be entirely abandoned as the
regulating principle of the world’s affairs: nobody professes it, and, as regards most of the relations between human beings,
nobody is permitted to practise it. When anyone succeeds in doing so, it is under cover of some pretext which gives him
the semblance of having some general social interest on his side. This being the ostensible state of things, people flatter
themselves that the rule of mere force is ended; that the law of the strongest cannot be the reason of existence of anything
which has remained in full operation down to the present time. However any of our present institutions may have begun,
it can only, they think, have been preserved to this period of advanced civilization by a well-grounded feeling of its adap-
tation to human nature, and conduciveness to the general good. They do not understand the great vitality and durability of
institutions which place right on the side of might; how intensely they are clung to; how the good as well as the bad
propensities and sentiments of those who have power in their hands, become identified with retaining it; how slowly these
bad institutions give way, one at a time, the weakest first, beginning with those which are least interwoven with the daily
habits of life; and how very rarely those who have obtained legal power because they first had physical, have ever lost their
hold of the former until the physical power had passed over to the other side. Such shifting of the physical force not
having taken place in the case of women; this fact, combined with all the peculiar and characteristic features of the par-
ticular case, made it certain from the first that this branch of the system of right founded on might, though softened in its
most atrocious features at an earlier period than several of the others, would be the very last to disappear. It was inevitable
that this one case of a social relation grounded on force would survive through generations of institutions grounded on equal
justice, an almost solitary exception to the general character of their laws and customs; but which, so long as it does not
proclaim its own origin, and as discussion has not brought out its true character, is not felt to jar with modern civilization,
any more than domestic slavery among the Greeks jarred with their notion of themselves as a free people.

Question:
1. Why, according to Mill, is his stated task so difficult?
23.5 Bernard Shaw: Act III from *Mrs. Warren’s Profession*

The winner of the 1925 Noble Prize in Literature, the playwright George Bernard Shaw (1856 – 1950) brought realism and ideas to English theater. His many plays explored the most pressing social issues of his day. In *Mrs. Warren’s Profession*, Shaw delved into the morality of prostitution.


FRANK. [to Vivie] Kissums?
VIVIE. [fiercely] No. I hate you. [She takes a couple of books and some paper from the writing-table, and sits down with them at the middle table, at the end next the fireplace]

FRANK. [grimacing] Sorry. [He goes for his cap and rifle. Mrs. Warren returns. He takes her hand] Goodnight, d e a r Mrs Warren. [He kisses her hand. She snatches it away, her lips tightening, and looks more than half disposed to box his ears. He laughs mischievously and runs off, clapping-to the door behind him]

MRS WARREN. [resigning herself to an evening of boredom now that the men are gone] Did you ever in your life hear anyone rattle on so? Isn’t he a tease? [She sits at the table] Now that I think of it, dearie, don’t you go on encouraging him. I’m sure he’s a regular good-for-nothing.

VIVIE. [rising to fetch more books] Why? [She sits down and opens a book]. Do you expect that we shall be much together? You and I, I mean?

MRS WARREN. [staring at her] Of course: until you’re married. Your not going back to college again.

VIVIE. Do you think my way of life would suit you? I doubt it.

MRS WARREN. You and I, I mean?

VIVIE. [cutting a page of her book with the paper knife on her chatelaine] Has it really never occurred to you, mother, that I have a way of life like other people?

MRS WARREN. What nonsense is this you’re trying to talk? Do you want to show your independence, now that you’re a great little person at school? Don’t be a fool, child.

VIVIE. [indulgently] That all you have to say on the subject, is it, mother?

MRS WARREN. [puzzled, then angry] Don’t keep on asking me questions like that. [Violently] Hold your tongue. [Vivie works on, losing no time, and saying nothing] You and your way of life, indeed! What next? [She looks at Vivie again. No reply] Your way of life will be what I please. [Another pause] I’ve been noticing these airs in you ever since you got that tripos or whatever you call it. If you think I’m going to put up with them you’re mistaken; and the sooner you find it out, the better. [Muttering] All I have to say on the subject, indeed! [Again raising her voice angrily] Do you know who you’re speaking to, Miss?

VIVIE. [looking across at her without raising her head from her book] No. Who are you? What are you?

MRS WARREN. [rising breathless] You young imp!

VIVIE. Everybody knows my reputation, my social standing, and the profession I intended to pursue. I know nothing about you. What is that way of life which you invite me to share with you and Sir George Crofts, pray?

MRS WARREN. Take care. I shall do something I’ll be sorry for after, and you too.

VIVIE. [putting aside her books with cool decision] Well, let us drop the subject until you are better able to face it. [Looking critically at her mother] You want some good walks and a little lawn tennis to set you up. You are shockingly out of condition: you were not able to manage twenty yards uphill today without stopping to pant; and your wrists are mere rolls of fat. Look at mine. [She holds out her wrists]

MRS WARREN. [after looking at her helplessly, begins to whimper] Vivie—

VIVIE. [springing up sharply] Now pray don’t begin to cry. Anything but that. I really cannot stand whimpering. I will go out of the room if you do.

MRS WARREN. [piteously] Oh, my darling, how can you be so hard on me? Have I no rights over you as your mother? Vivie. Are you my mother?

MRS WARREN. [appalled] Am I your mother! Oh, Vivie!
MRS WARREN. [distracted, throwing herself on her knees] Oh no, no. Stop, stop. I am your mother: I swear it. Oh, you can't mean to turn on me—my own child! It's not natural. You believe me, don't you? Say you believe me.

VIVIE. Who was my father?

MRS WARREN. You don't know what you're asking. I can't tell you.

VIVIE. [determinedly] Oh yes you can, if you like. I have a right to know and you know very well that I have that right. You can refuse to tell me, if you please; but if you do, you will see the last of me tomorrow morning.

MRS WARREN. Oh, it's too horrible to hear you talk like that. You wouldn't—you couldn't leave me.

VIVIE. [ruthlessly] Yes, without a moment's hesitation, if you trifle with me about this. [Shivering with disgust] How can I feel sure that I may not have the contaminated blood of that brutal waster in my veins?

MRS WARREN. No, no. On my oath it's not he, nor any of the rest that you have ever met. I'm certain of that, at least.

VIVIE. [slowly] You are certain of that, at least. Ah! You mean that is all you are certain of. [Thoughtfully] I see.

Vivie's eyes fasten sternly on her mother as the significance of this flashes on her.

[Mrs. Warren buries her face in her hands] Don't do that, mother: you know you don't feel it a bit. [Mrs Warren takes down her hands and looks up deplorably at Vivie, who takes out her watch and says] Well, that is enough for tonight. At what hour would you like breakfast? Is half-past eight too early for you?

MRS WARREN. [wildly] My God, what sort of woman are you?

VIVIE. [coolly] The sort the world is mostly made of, I should hope. Otherwise I don't understand how it gets its business done. Come [taking her mother by the wrist, and pulling her up pretty resolutely]! Pull yourself together. That's right.

MRS WARREN. [querulously] You're very rough with me, Vivie.

VIVIE. Nonsense. What about bed? It's past ten.

MRS WARREN. [passionately] What the use of my going to bed? Do you think I could sleep?

VIVIE. Why not? I shall.

MRS WARREN. You! you've no heart. [She suddenly breaks out vehemently in her natural tongue—the dialect of a woman of the people—with all her affections of maternal authority and conventional manners gone and an overwhelming inspiration of true conviction and scorn in her.] Oh, I won't bear it: I won't put up with the injustice of it. What right have you to set yourself up above me like this? You boast of what you are to me—to me, who gave you the chance of being what you are. What chance had I! Shame on you for a bad daughter and a stuck-up prude!

VIVIE. [sitting down with a shrug, no longer confident; for her replies, which have sounded sensible and strong to her so far, now begin to ring rather woodenly and even priggishly against the new tone of her mother] D'you know what your gran'mother was?

MRS WARREN. My own opinions and my own way of life! Listen to her talking! Do you think I was brought up like you? able to pick and choose my own way of life? Do you think I did what I did because I liked it, or thought it right, or wouldn't rather have gone to college and been a lady if I'd had the chance?

VIVIE. Everybody has some choice, mother. The poorest girl alive may not be able to choose between being Queen of England or Principal of Newnham; but she can choose between ragpicking and flower-selling, according to her taste. People are always blaming their circumstances for what they are. I don't believe in circumstances. The people who get on in this world are the people who get up and look for the circumstances they want, and, if they can't find them, make them.

MRS WARREN. Oh, it's easy to talk, very easy, isn't it? Here! would you like to know what my circumstances were?

VIVIE. Yes: you had better tell me. Wont you sit down?

MRS WARREN. Oh, I'll sit down: don't you be afraid. [She plants her chair farther forward with brazen energy, and sits down. Vivie is impressed in spite of herself] D'you know what your gran'mother was?

VIVIE. No.
MRS WARREN. No you dont. I do. She called herself a widow and had a fried-fish shop down by the Mint, and kept herself and four daughters out of it. Two of us were sisters: that was me and Liz; and we were both good-looking and well made. I suppose our father was a well-fed man: mother pretended he was a gentleman; but I dont know. The other two were only half sisters: undersized, ugly, starved looking, hard working, honest poor creatures: Liz and I would have half-murdered them if mother hadn’t half-murdered us to keep our hands off them. They were the respectable ones. Well, what did they get by their respectability? I’ll tell you. One of them worked in a whitelead factory twelve hours a day for nine shillings a week until she died of lead poisoning. She only expected to get her hands a little paralyzed; but she died. The other was always held up to us as a model because she married a Government laborer in the Deptford victualling yard, and kept his room and the three children neat and tidy on eighteen shillings a week—until he took to drink. That was worth being respectable for, wasn’t it?

VIVIE. [now thoughtfully attentive] Did you and your sister think so?

MRS WARREN. Liz didnt, I can tell you: she had more spirit. We both went to a church school—that was part of the lady-like airs we got ourselves to be superior to the children that knew nothing and went nowhere—and we stayed there until Liz went out one night and never came back. I know the school-mistress thought I’d soon follow her example: for the clergyman was always warning me that Lizzie’d died by jumping off Waterloo Bridge. Poor fool: that was all he knew about it! But I was more afraid of the whitelead factory than I was of the river; and so would you have been in my place. That clergyman got me a situation as a scullery maid in a temperance restaurant where they sent out for anything you liked. Then I was waitress; and then I went to the bar at Waterloo station: fourteen hours a day serving drinks and washing glasses for four shillings a week and my board. That was considered a great promotion for me. Well, one cold, wretched night when I was so tired I could hardly keep myself awake, who should come up for a half of Scotch but Lizzie, in a long fur cloak, elegant and comfortable, with a lot of sovereigns in her purse.

VIVIE. [grimly] My aunt Lizzie!

MRS WARREN. Yes; and a very good aunt to have, too. She’s living down at Winchester now, close to the cathedral, one of the most respectable ladies there. Chaperones girls at the county ball, if you please. No river for Liz, thank you! You remind me of Liz a little: she was a first rate business woman—saved money from the beginning—never let herself look too like what she was—never lost her head or threw away a chance. When she saw I'd grown up good-looking she said to me across the bar “What are you doing there, you little fool? wearing out your health and your appearance for other people’s profit!” Liz was saving money then to take a house for herself in Brussels; and she thought we two could save faster than one. So she lent me some money and gave me a start; and I saved steadily and first paid her back, and then went into business with her as her partner. Why shouldn’t I have done it? The house in Brussels was real high class: a much better place for a woman to be in than the factory where Anne Jane got poisoned. None of our girls were ever treated as I was treated in the scullery of that temperance place, or at the Waterloo bar, or at home. Would you have had me stay in them and become a worn out old drudge before I was forty?

VIVIE. [intensely interested by this time] No; but why did you choose that business? Saving money and good management will succeed in any business.

MRS WARREN. Yes, saving money. But where can a woman get the money to save in any other business? Could you save out of four shillings a week, and keep yourself dressed as well? Not you. Of course, if youre a plain woman and cant earn anything more; or if you have a turn for music, or the stage, or newspaper writing; thats different. But neither Liz nor I had any turn for such things: all we had was our appearance and our turn for pleasing men. Do you think we were such fools as to let other people trade in our good looks by employing us as showgirls, or barmaids, or waitresses, when we could trade in them ourselves and get all the profits instead of starvation wages? Not likely.

VIVIE. You were certainly quite justified—from the business point of view.

MRS WARREN. Yes; or any other point of view. What is any respectable girl brought up to do but to catch some rich man’s fancy and get the benefit of his money by marrying him?—as if a marriage ceremony could make any difference in the right or wrong of the thing! Oh! the hypocrisy of the world makes me sick! Liz and I had to work and save and calculate just like other people; elseways we should be as poor as any good-for-nothing drunken waster of a woman that thinks her luck will last for ever. [With great energy] I despise such people: they’ve no character; and if theres a thing I hate in a woman, it’s want of character.

VIVIE. Come now, mother: frankly! Isn’t it part of what you call character in a woman that she should greatly dislike such a way of making money?
MRS WARREN. Why, of course. Everybody dislikes having to work and make money; but they have to do it all the same. I’m sure I’ve often pitied a poor girl; tired out and in low spirits, having to try to please some man that she doesn’t care two straws for—some half-drunk fool that thinks he’s making himself agreeable when he’s teasing and worrying and disgusting a woman so that hardly any money could pay her for putting up with it. But she has to bear with disagreeables and take the rough with the smooth, just like a nurse in a hospital or anyone else. It’s not work that any woman would do for pleasure, goodness knows; though to hear the pious people talk you would suppose it was a bed of roses.

VIVIE. Still, you consider it worth while. It pays.

MRS WARREN. Of course it’s worth while to a poor girl, if she can resist temptation and is good-looking and well conducted and sensible. It’s far better than any other employment open to her. I always thought that oughtn’t to be. It can’t be right, Vivie, that there shouldn’t be better opportunities for women. I stick to that: it’s wrong. But it’s so, right or wrong; and a girl must make the best of it. But of course it’s not worth while for a lady. If you took to it you’d be a fool; but I should have been a fool if I’d taken to anything else.

VIVIE. [more and more deeply moved] Mother; suppose we were both as poor as you were in those wretched old days, are you quite sure that you wouldn’t advise me to try the Waterloo bar, or marry a laborer, or even go into the factory?

MRS WARREN. [indignantly] Of course not. What sort of mother do you take me for! How could you keep your self-respect in such starvation and slavery? And what’s a woman worth? what’s life worth? without self-respect? Why am I independent and able to give my daughter a first-rate education, when other women that had just as good opportunities are in the gutter? Because I always knew how to respect myself and control myself. Why is Liz looked up to in a cathedral town? The same reason. Where would we be now if we’d minded the clergyman’s foolishness? Scrubbing floors for one and sixpence a day and nothing to look forward to but the workhouse infirmary. Don’t you be led astray by people who don’t know the world, my girl. The only way for a woman to provide for herself decently is for her to be good to some man that can afford to be good to her. If she’s in his own station of life, let her make him marry her; but if she’s far beneath him she can’t expect it: why should she? it wouldn’t be for her own happiness. Ask any lady in London society that has daughters; and she’ll tell you the same, except that I tell you straight and she’ll tell you crooked. That’s all the difference.

VIVIE. [fascinated, gazing at her] My dear mother; you are a wonderful woman: you are stronger than all England. And you are really a truly not one wee bit doubtful—or—or—ashamed?

MRS WARREN. Well, of course, dearie, it’s only good manners to be ashamed of it; it’s expected from a woman. Women have to pretend to feel a great deal that they don’t feel. Liz used to be angry with me for plumping out the truth about it. She used to say that when every woman could learn enough from what was going on in the world before her eyes, there was no need to talk about it to her. But this Liz was such a perfect lady! She had the true instinct of it; while I was always a bit of a vulgarian. I used to be so pleased when you sent us your photos to see that you were growing up like Liz: you’ve just her ladylike, determined way. But I cant stand saying one thing when everyone knows I mean another. What’s the use in such hypocrisy? people arrange the world that way for women, there’s no good pretending its arranged the other way. No: I never was a bit ashamed really. I consider I had a right to be proud of how we managed everything so respectably, and never had a word against us, and how the girls were so well taken care of. Some of them did very well: one of them married an ambassador. But of course now I dare’t talk about such things: whatever would they think of us! [She yawns] Oh dear, I do believe I’m getting sleepy after all. [She stretches herself lazily, thoroughly relieved by her explosion, and placidly ready for her night’s rest.]

VIVIE. I believe it is I who will not be able to sleep now. [She goes to the dresser and lights the candle. Then she extinguishes the lamp, darkening the room a good deal] Better let in some fresh air before locking up. [She opens the cottage door, and finds that it is broad moonlight.] What a beautiful night! Look! [She draws aside the curtains of the window. The landscape is seen bathed in the radiance of the harvest moon rising over Blackdown]

VIVIE. [with a perfunctory glance at the scene] Yes, dear; but take care you don’t catch your death of cold from the night air.

VIVIE. [contemptuously] Nonsense.

MRS WARREN. [querulously] Oh yes: everything I say is nonsense, according to you.
VIVIE. [turning to her quickly] No: really that is not so, mother. You have got completely the better of me tonight, though I intended it to be the other way. Let us be good friends now.

MRS WARREN. [shaking her head a little ruefully] So it has been the other way. But I suppose I must give in to it. I always got the worst of it from Liz; and now I suppose it’ll be the same with you.

VIVIE. Well, never mind. Come: goodnight, dear old mother. [She take her mother in her arms]

MRS WARREN. [fondly] I brought you up well, didn’t I, dearie?

VIVIE. You did.

MRS WARREN. And you’ll be good to your poor old mother for it, won’t you?

VIVIE. I will, dear. [Kissing her] Goodnight.

MRS WARREN. [with unction] Blessings on my own dearie darling, a mother’s blessing!

She embraces her daughter protectingly, instinctively looking upward for divine sanction.

Question:
1. How does Mrs. Warren get the best of Vivie in their discussion?
23.6 Gertrude Himmelfarb: from Poverty and Compassion

In Poverty and Compassion, the historian Gertrude Himmelfarb investigated the response of late-nineteenth-century Britains to poverty. In the excerpt included here, she discussed the late nineteenth-century definition of the term “socialism.”


“We are all socialists now.” The remark was reputedly made in 1888 by Sir William Harcourt, a prominent Liberal Member of Parliament. By 1895 that sentiment had become so commonplace that it was echoed, perhaps cynically, by the Prince of Wales.

By the commonly accepted definition of socialism today, and even by that of some socialists at the time, the statement was, of course, not true. Even by the laxer standards of the time it was not literally true. Certainly it did not apply to Herbert Spencer, A. V. Dicey, Helen Bosanquet, W. H. Mallock, G. J. Goschen, Henry Maine, the Duke of Argyll, the members of the Liberty and Property League, and all the others who resisted any suspicion of socialism, any deviation from the old school of political economy. They did so, however, knowing that they were fighting a losing battle. In 1885, after the publication of his testament of individualism, The Man Versus the State, Spencer told Andrew Carnegie that he was giving up political writing. “The wave of opinion carrying us toward Socialism and utter subordination of the individual is becoming irresistible.”

If socialism was becoming “irresistible,” if “we are all socialists now,” it was not only because of the emergence, within a few years, of the single-tax and land nationalization movements, the Social Democratic Federation, the Socialist League, the Fabian Society, and assorted religious socialist groups. It was also because the word “socialism” was used in the most latitudinarian sense to connote any social reform, any act of state intervention, any degree of “collectivism” (a word that came into currency in the 1880s and that was a common synonym for socialism)—even any concern with the “social problem.” As early as 1882, before any of the socialist groups had been founded, Alfred Milner, then a young journalist in London, gave a talk in Whitechapel which opened: “Socialism has become a word of everyday use, and, like other words of everyday use, it means almost anything according to the context or the degree of education and the bias of the speaker.” The following year, inspired by a lecture by William Morris, the Oxford Magazine put the question “Is the new Oxford movement to be a Socialistic one?” The answer was yes, the magazine explained, on the understanding that what was meant by socialism was an interest in social questions. Canon Barnett’s definition of “practicable socialism” included such measures as the poor law, the education act, the Irish land acts, the housing act, and the libraries act. This was not very different from Sidney Webb’s “unconscious socialism,” which also included the poor law, education act, and all the other reforms that had already set England, as Webb saw it, on the path to a full-fledged socialism.

It was not for want of a more rigorous definition that contemporaries spoke of socialism so loosely. Thirty years earlier, in what became the standard text of political economy, John Stuart Mill had defined socialism as “any system which requires that the land and the instruments of production should be the property, not of individuals, but of communities or associations, or of the government.” That definition would have satisfied a later generation of Marxists, as well as some critics of socialism. A. J. Balfour, the leader of the Conservative Party, protested against the confusion of social legislation with socialism. Social reform was not only different from socialism, he insisted; it was “its most direct opposite and its most effective antidote.” This was not, however, the prevailing view. More often social reform was seen, by socialists and anti-socialists alike, as in a continuum with socialism.

It was this latitudinarian interpretation that made it possible for some politicians to be accused of being socialists and others to lay claim to that title. In 1883, when Lord Salisbury proposed low-interest government loans to subsidize housing for the poor, Joseph Chamberlain publicly criticized that “socialistic” scheme. Two years later Chamberlain issued his own “Unauthorized Programme” advocating reforms in local government, education, landholding, and taxation. It was not a communist program, his supporters explained: “Communism means the reduction of everything to a dead level, the

---

*The first example of “collectivism” in the Oxford English Dictionary is from the Saturday Review in 1880, where it was defined as the theory that “everything is to be done and managed by a society.” A. V. Dicey explained that he used the word as the antithesis to individualism, a usage that was “etymologically correct” and justified by the “novelty and vagueness of the term.”

** Mill distinguished socialism from communism, which, on the Continent at least, usually meant “the entire abolition of private property.” In fact, in Mill’s time as later in the century, and in England as on the Continent, the two terms were often used interchangeably. If socialism was more common in late-Victorian England, it was because it lent itself to a laxer meaning, “social reform” being often identified with “socialism.”
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destruction of private adventure, the paralysis of private industry, the atrophy of private effort.” But it could properly be regarded as socialistic. “This will be called Socialism with a vengeance,” for it sounds the “death-knell of the laissez-faire system” and continues the “path of legislative progress in England [that] has been for years, and must continue to be, distinctly Socialistic.”

Just as social reform was conflated with socialism, so “Tory democracy” was conflated with Tory socialism. When Randolph Churchill spoke of Tory democracy (which he did less often than has been supposed), he generally meant the democratizing of the Conservative Party rather than the adoption of social reforms. But he was not averse to the latter. One of his opponents in the Conservative Party, objecting to his proposal to convert urban leaseholds into freeholds, said that it was “rank Socialism—a policy of plunder and confiscation.” In his biography of Churchill, in 1906, Lord Rosebery described him as very nearly equating “Tory Democracy” with “Tory Collectivism,” which Rosebery himself equates with socialism. Winston Churchill, in his biography of his father published shortly before, intimated that Randolph Churchill might well have been a true “Tory socialist” had he survived into the twentieth century. (It is curious to find a very different kind of Conservative, Harold Macmillan, declaring half a century later that “Toryism has always been a form of paternal Socialism.”)

Even Gladstone, who was not, in any sense, a socialist, who remained a Cobdenite at heart, committed to laissez-faire, free trade, and economic government, was sufficiently responsive to the political realities to lend his support to factory and land reforms. To critics like the Duke of Argyll, who accused him of condoning socialism, he replied that he did in fact “deeply deplore” and “radically disapprove” of socialism, but that it was a decided trend in both parties. He gave much the same assurance to Queen Victoria when she urged him to disavow the Chamberlain wing of his party and explain to the electorate “that liberalism is not Socialism and that progress does not mean Revolution.” To Lord Acton he complained about the “demagogism” of the Tory democrats and the doctrine of “construction” (a euphemism for socialism) that was gaining favor in his own party—a policy of “taking into the hands of the state the business of the individual man.” Yet Acton himself told Gladstone’s daughter that she should be proud to know that her father was the “most illustrious representative in England” and the “most eminent practical teacher in the world” of the school of “academic Socialists.” Acton also said, again in praise, that he agreed with Chamberlain that “there is a latent Socialism in the Gladstonian philosophy.” (This “latent” or “academic” socialism was very different from the Marxism that Acton condemned as “the worst of all enemies of freedom.”)***

“We are all socialists now.” No, not quite. Yet it would be a mistake to dismiss this remark as a bit of rhetorical hyperbole, or to belittle a “socialism” that was so all-embracing. The word was not used lightly and its usage was significant. That so many serious, thoughtful people were prepared to identify themselves as socialists testifies to the gravity of their social concerns; it also suggests that they sensed that something new and momentous was happening, something that, however diffuse and varied, warranted that provocative label.

Their socialism, then, was serious, even if it did not mean what it might be taken to mean today. The common equation of “socialism” with “collectivism” implied not so much a rejection of capitalism (in most cases, it did not imply that at all) as a rejection of laissez-faire. Laissez-faireists, we are often reminded, were never as laissez-faireist in practice as in theory (and perhaps not as much in theory either). The doctrine had always allowed for some measures of social reform—exceptional measures for specified groups in special circumstances (children, women, or men in hazardous industries). What was novel about the reforms of a later generation, reforms regarded as “collectivist,” was that they were not exceptional measures but normal ones, applying to a large part of the population, adults as well as children, men as well as women, in the regular course of their lives.

*** This view of Gladstone as a “latent” socialist is echoed by one historian who finds that in his last administration Gladstone “went a surprisingly long way down the Socialist road,” what with the imposition of death duties on landed estates, the establishment of a labour department, the expansion of factory regulation and inspection, the provision of an eight-hour day for railwaymen, and the passage of a workmen’s compensation act. 21
Collectivism too (like laissez-faire) was less rigorous than it might have been. It was, one might say, a permissive rather than prescriptive principle; it allowed for government intervention when that seemed desirable, but did not mandate any thoroughgoing or systematic involvement of the government. Nor did it imply any commitment to egalitarianism. Nor was it meant to preclude individualism. On the contrary, the avowed purpose of almost all socialists was to institute such reforms as would enable the poor to become more responsible and independent individuals. It was in this sense that so staunch an individualist as Bernard Bosanquet (who managed to combine Hegelian metaphysics with laissez-faire economics) spoke approvingly of “moral socialism.” This form of socialism was salutary, he said, because it exposed the evils of egoism, materialism, and Epicureanism, at the same time that it made the public good part of the “moral essence of the individual.”

Late-Victorian socialism meant different things to different people. But it was sufficiently meaningful to be applied, at one time or another, to Gladstonians and Disraelians, new radicals and new liberals, land nationalizers and gas-and-water socialists, Christians and Positivists, Marxists and Fabians, members of the Ethical Societies, and others who often used that label for want of another.

**Question:**
1. In what sense is the phrase “we are all socialists now,” accurate according to Himmelfarb?
24.1 George Eliot: Essay on Margaret Fuller and Mary Wollstonecraft

George Eliot was the pseudonym for Marian Evans (1819–1880), the daughter of a land agent in Warwickshire. Her first novel was *Adam Bede*, an immensely popular work published in 1829 when she was forty years old*. Moving to London after the death of her father in 1851, she obtained an appointment as an assistant editor of the *Westminster Review*. During this period she wrote a number of essays, including the following retrospective book review for another periodical, *The Leader*, in 1855.


The dearth of new books just now gives us time to recur to less recent ones which we have hitherto noticed but slightly; and among these we choose the late edition of Margaret Fuller’s *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*, because we think it has been unduly thrust into the background by less comprehensive and candid productions on the same subject. Notwithstanding certain defects of taste and a sort of vague spiritualism and grandiloquence which belong to all but the very best American writers, the book is a valuable one; it has the enthusiasm of a noble and sympathetic nature, with the moderation and breadth and large allowance of a vigorous and cultivated understanding. There is no exaggeration of woman’s moral excellence or intellectual capabilities; no injudicious insistence on her fitness for this or that function hitherto engrossed by men; but a calm plea for the removal of unjust laws and artificial restrictions, so that the possibilities of her nature may have room for full development, a wisely stated demand to disencumber her of the

Parasitic forms
That seem to keep her up, but drag her down—
And leave her field to burgeon and to bloom
From all within her, make herself her own
To give or keep, to live and learn and be
All that not harms distinctive womanhood.1

It is interesting to compare this essay of Margaret Fuller’s published in its earliest form in 1843, with a work on the position of woman, written between sixty and seventy years ago—we mean Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Rights of Woman*. The latter work was not continued beyond the first volume; but so far as this carries the subject, the comparison, at least in relation to strong sense and loftiness of moral tone, is not at all disadvantageous to the woman of the last century. There is in some quarters a vague prejudice against the *Rights of Woman* as in some way or other a reprehensible book, but readers who go to it with this impression will be surprised to find it eminently serious, severely moral, and withal rather heavy—the true reason, perhaps, that no edition has been published since 1796, and that it is now rather scarce. There are several points of resemblance, as well as of striking difference, between the two books. A strong understanding is present in both; but Margaret Fuller’s mind was like some regions of her own American continent, where you are constantly stepping from the sunny “clearings” into the mysterious twilight of the tangled forest—she often passes in one breath from forcible reasoning to dreamy vagueness; moreover, her unusually varied culture gives her great command of illustration, Mary Wollstonecraft, on the other hand, is nothing if not rational; she has no erudition, and her grave pages are lit up by no ray of fancy. In both writers we discern, under the brave bearing of a strong and truthful nature, the beating of a loving woman’s heart, which teaches them not to undervalue the smallest offices of domestic care or kindliness. But Margaret Fuller, with all her passionate sensibility, is more of the literary woman, who would not have been satisfied without intellectual production; Mary Wollstonecraft, we imagine, wrote not at all for writing’s sake, but from the pressure of other motives. So far as the difference of date allows, there is a striking coincidence in their trains of thought; indeed, every important idea in the *Rights of Woman*, except the combination of home education with a common day-school for boys and girls, reappears in Margaret Fuller’s essay....

1 These lines are from Alfred Lord Tennyson, *The Princess*, 7.253–258.
There is a notion commonly entertained among men that an instructed woman, capable of having opinions, is likely to prove an unpracticable yoke-fellow, always pulling one way when her husband wants to go the other, oracular in tone, and prone to give curtain lectures\(^2\) on metaphysics. But surely, so far as obstinacy is concerned, your unreasoning animal is the most unmanageable of creatures, where you are not allowed to settle the question by a cudgel, a whip and bridle, or even a string to the leg. For our own parts, we see no consistent or commodious medium between the old plan of corporal discipline and that thorough education of women which will make them rational beings in the highest sense of the word. Wherever weakness is not harshly controlled it must govern, as you may see when a strong man holds a little child by the hand, how he is pulled hither and thither, and wearied in his walk by his submission to the whims and feeble movements of his companion. A really cultured woman, like a really cultured man, will be ready to yield in trifles. So far as we see, there is no indissoluble connection between infirmity of logic and infirmity of will, and a woman quite innocent of an opinion in philosophy, is as likely as not to have an indomitable opinion about the kitchen. As to airs of superiority, no woman ever had them in consequence of true culture, but only because her culture was shallow or unreal, only as a result of what Mrs. Malaprop well calls “the ineffectual qualities in a woman”\(^3\)—mere acquisitions carried about, and not knowledge thoroughly assimilated so as to enter into the growth of the character.

To return to Margaret Fuller, some of the best things she says are on the folly of absolute definitions of woman’s nature and absolute damarcations of woman’s mission. “Nature,” she says, “seems to delight in varying the arrangements, as if to show that she will be fettered by no rule; and we must admit the same varieties that she admits.” Again: “If nature is never bound down, nor the voice of inspiration stifled, that is enough. We are pleased that women should write and speak, if they feel need of it, from having something to tell; but silence for ages would be no misfortune, if that silence be from divine command, and not from man’s tradition.” And here is a passage, the beginning of which has been often quoted:

If you ask me what offices they [women] may fill, I reply, any I do not care what case you put; let them be sea-captains if you will. I do not doubt there are women well fitted for such an office, and, if so, I should be as glad as to welcome the Maid of Saragossa, or the Maid of Missolonghi, or the Suliote heroine, or Emily Plater.\(^4\) I think women need, especially at this juncture, a much greater range of occupation than they have, to rouse their latent powers. In families that I know, some little girls like to saw wood, others to use carpenter’s tools. Where these tastes are indulged, cheerfulness and good-humor are promoted. Where they are forbidden, because “such things are not proper for girls,” they grow sullen and mischievous Fourier had observed these wants of women, as no one can fail to do who watches the desires of little girls, or knows the ennui that haunts grown women, except where they make to themselves a serene little world by art of some kind. He, therefore, in proposing a great variety of employments in manufactures or the care of plants and animals, allows for one-third of women as likely to have a taste for masculine pursuits, one-third of men for feminine... I have no doubt, however, that a large proportion of women would give themselves to the same employments as now, because there are circumstances that must lead them. Mothers will delight to make the nest soft and warm. Nature would take care of that; no need to clip the wings of any bird that wants to soar and sing, or finds in itself the strength of pinion for a migratory flight unusual to its kind. The difference would be that all need not he constrained to employments for which some are unfit.

Apropos of the same subject, we find Mary Wollstonecraft offering a suggestion which the women of the United States have already begun to carry out.

She says:

Women in particular, all want to be ladies, which is simply to have nothing to do, but listlessly to go they scarcely care where, for they cannot tell what. But what have women to do in society? I may be asked, but to loiter with easy grace; surely you would not condemn them all to suckle fools and chronicle small beer. No. Women might certainly study the art of healing, and be physicians as well as nurses. ... Business of various kinds they might likewise pursue, if they were educated in a more orderly manner... Women would not then marry for a support, as men accept of places under government and neglect the implied duties.

---

\(^2\) In Mrs. Caudle’s Curtain Lectures, written in 1846 by Douglas Jerrold, there is a comic sketch of a wife who delivers nightly lectures to her husband from behind their bed curtains. * Her subsequent novels include The Mill on the Floss (1860) and Middlemarch (1871–2).
\(^3\) Mrs. Malaprop is a character in The Rivals, by Richard Brinsley Sheridan, 1775. In response to compliments about her "intellectual accomplishment," Mrs. Malaprop exclaims, "Ah! Few gentlemen, nowadays, know how to value the ineffectual qualities in a woman!"
\(^4\) These are all heroines who distinguished themselves in war, the most obvious masculine field of activity. Maria Agustin was the Maid of Saragossa who fought against the French at the siege of Saragossa, Spain in 1808. The Maid of Missolonghi was an unidentified Greek girl at the Turkish sieges of that town in 1822 or 1826. The Suliote heroine was probably Moscha, who led a band of 300 women against the Turks during the siege of Souli in Albania, 1803. Emily Plater, a Polish patriot, became a captain in command of a company in the insurgent army fighting the Russians in 1831.
Men pay a heavy price for their reluctance to encourage self-help and independent resources in women. The precious meridian years of many a man of genius have to be spent in the toil of routine, that an “establishment” may be kept up for a woman who can understand none of his secret yearnings, who is fit for nothing but to sit in her drawing-room like a doll-Madonna in her shrine. No matter. Anything is more endurable than to change our established formulae about women, or to run the risk of looking up to our wives instead of looking down on them. *Sit divus, dummodo non sit vivus* (let him be a god, provided he be not living), said the Roman magnates of Romulus, and so men say of women, let them be idols, useless absorbents of previous things, provided we are not obliged to admit them to be strictly fellow-beings, to be treated, one and all, with justice and sober reverence.

On one side we hear that woman's position can never be improved until women themselves are better; and, on the other, that women can never become better until their position is improved—until the laws are made more just, and a wider field opened to feminine activity. But we constantly hear the same difficulty stated about the human race in general. There is a perpetual action and reaction between individuals and institutions; we must try and mend both by little and little—the only way in which human things can be mended. Unfortunately, many over-zealous champions of women assert their actual equality with men—nay, even their moral superiority to men—as a ground for their release from oppressive laws and restrictions. They lose strength immensely by this false position. If it were true, then there would be a case in which slavery and ignorance nourished virtue, and so far we should have an argument for the continuance of bondage. But we want freedom and culture for woman, because subjection and ignorance have debased her, and with her, Man; for—

> If she be small, slight-natured, miserable,  
> How shall men grow?

Both Margaret Fuller and Mary Wollstonecraft have too much sagacity to fall into this sentimental exaggeration. Their ardent hopes of what women may become do not prevent them from seeing and painting women as they are. On the relative moral excellence of men and women Mary Wollstonecraft speaks with the most decision:

Women are supposed to possess more sensibility, and even humanity, than men, and their strong attachments and instantaneous emotions of compassion are given as proofs; but the clinging affection of ignorance has seldom anything noble in it, and may mostly be resolved into selfishness, as well as the affection of children and brutes. I have known many weak women whose sensibility was entirely engrossed by their husbands; and as for their humanity, it was very faint indeed, or rather it was only a transient emotion of compassion. Humanity does not consist “in a squeamish ear,” says an eminent orator. “It belongs to the mind as well as to the nerves.” But this kind of exclusive affection, though it degrades the individual, should not be brought forward as a proof of the inferiority of the sex, because it is the natural consequence of confined views; for even women of superior sense, having their attention turned to little employments and private plans, rarely rise to heroism, unless when spurred on by love! and love, as an heroic passion, like genius, appears but once in an age. I therefore agree with the moralist who asserts “that women have seldom so much generosity as men”; and that their narrow affections, to which justice and humanity are often sacrificed, render the sex apparently inferior, especially as they are commonly inspired by men; but I contend that the heart would expand as the understanding gained strength, if women were not depressed from their cradles.

We had marked several other passages of Margaret Fuller’s for extract, but as we do not aim at an exhaustive treatment of our subject, and are only touching a few of its points, we have, perhaps, already claimed as much of the reader’s attention as he will be willing to give to such desultory material.

**Questions:**

1. According to this essay, what are the “Parasitic forms/That seem to keep [woman] up, but drag her down?” How does this essay argue that men themselves suffer from over-dependent women?
2. What does Eliot see as the difference between Margaret Fuller’s and Mary Wollstonecraft’s books?
3. What changes in society do the essayist and the women she discusses support?
4. Are these women feminists? Why or why not?

---

5 Romulus is the mythical founder and first king of Rome.
24.2 An Advocate for Science Education

Charles Darwin (1809–1882) traveled as a naturalist on board the HMS Beagle (1831–36) and published *Origin of the Species* (1859). The following excerpts from his autobiography detail his perceptions about his education. Traditional education at the time entailed classical learning and rhetoric, with little attention to the sciences. Phrenology was the study of human facial characteristics to determine one’s character—thus the references to his nose and the shape of his head.


Nothing could have been worse for the development of my mind than Dr. Butler’s school, as it was strictly classical, nothing else being taught except a little ancient geography and history. The school as a means of education to me was simply a blank. During my whole life I have been singularly incapable of mastering any language. Especial attention was paid to verse-making, and this I could never do well. I had many friends, and got together a grand collection of old verses, which by patching together, sometimes aided by other boys, I could work into any subject. Much attention was paid to learning by heart the lessons of the previous day; this I could effect with great facility learning forty or fifty lines of Virgil or Homer, whilst I was in morning chapel; but this exercise was utterly useless, for every verse was forgotten in forty-eight hours.

Early in my school-days a boy had a copy of the *Wonders of the World*, which I often read and disputed with other boys about the veracity of some of the statements; and I believe this book first gave me a wish to travel in remote countries, which was ultimately fulfilled by the voyage of the Beagle. In the latter part of my school life I became passionately fond of shooting, and I do not believe that anyone could have shown more zeal for the most holy cause than I did for shooting birds.

With respect to science, I continued collecting minerals with much zeal, but quite unscientifically—all that I cared for was a new named mineral, and I hardly attempted to classify them.

Towards the close of my school life, my brother worked hard at chemistry and made a fair laboratory with proper apparatus in the tool-house in the garden, and I was allowed to aid him as a servant in most of his experiments. He made all the gases and many compounds, and I read with care several books on chemistry, such as Henry and Parkes’ *Chemical Catechism*. The subject interested me greatly, and we often used to go on working till rather late at night. This was the best part of my education at school, for it showed me practically the meaning of experimental science. The fact that we worked at chemistry somehow got known at school, and as it was an unprecedented fact, I was nicknamed “Gas.” I was also once publicly rebuked by the head-master, Dr. Butler, for thus wasting my time over such useless subjects;

During the three years which I spent at Cambridge my time was wasted, as far as the academical studies were concerned, as completely as at Edinburgh and at school.

Although as we shall presently see there were some redeeming features in my life at Cambridge, my time was sadly wasted there and worse than wasted. From my passion for shooting and for hunting and when this failed, for riding across country I got into a sporting set, including some dissipated low-minded young men. We used often to dine together in the evening, though these dinners often included men of a higher stamp, and we sometimes drank too much, with jolly singing and playing at cards afterwards. I know that I ought to feel ashamed of days and evenings thus spent, but as some of my friends were very pleasant and we were all in the highest spirits, I cannot help looking back to these times with much pleasure.
But no pursuit at Cambridge was followed with nearly so much eagerness or gave me so much pleasure as collecting beetles. It was the mere passion for collecting, for I did not dissect them and rarely compared their external characters with published descriptions, but got them named anyhow.

I was very successful in collecting and invented two new methods; I employed a labourer to scrape during the winter, moss off old trees and place [it] in a large bag, and likewise to collect the rubbish at the bottom of the barges in which reeds are brought from the fens, and thus I got some very rare species. No poet ever felt more delight at seeing his first poem published than I did at seeing in Stephen’s Illustrations of British Insects the magic words, “captured by C. Darwin, Esq.”

On returning home from my short geological tour in N. Wales, I found a letter from Henslow, informing me that Captain Fitz-Roy was willing to give up part of his own cabin to any young man who would volunteer to go with him without pay as naturalist to the Voyage of the Beagle. I have given as I believe in my M.S. Journal an account of all the circumstances which then occurred; I will here only say that I was instantly eager to accept the offer, but my father strongly objected, adding the words fortunate for me,—“If you can find any man of common sense, who advises you to go, I will give my consent.” So I wrote that evening and refused the offer.

[His uncle then argued he should go, and his father consented.] The voyage of the Beagle has been by far the most important event in my life and has determined my whole career; yet it depended on so small a circumstance as my uncle offering to drive me 30 miles to Shrewsbury, which few uncles would have done, and on such a trifle as the shape of my nose. I have always felt that I owe to the voyage the first real training or education of my mind. I was led to attend closely to several branches of natural history, and thus my powers of observation were improved, though they were already fairly developed.

The investigation of the geology of all the places visited was far more important, as reasoning here comes into play. On first examining a new district nothing can appear more hopeless than the chaos of rocks; but by recording the stratification and nature of the rocks and fossils at many points, always reasoning and predicting what will be found elsewhere, light soon begins to dawn on the district, and the structure of the whole becomes more or less intelligible. I had brought with me the first volume of Lyell’s Principles of Geology, which I studied attentively; and this book was of the highest service to me in many ways. The very first place which I examined, namely St. Jago in the Cape Verde islands, showed me clearly the wonderful superiority of Lyell’s manner of treating geology, compared with that of any other author, whose works I had with me or ever afterwards read.

Another of my occupations was collecting animals of all classes, briefly describing and roughly dissecting many of the marine ones; but from not being able to draw and from not having sufficient anatomical knowledge a great pile of MS. which I made during the voyage has proved almost useless. I thus lost much time, with the exception of that spent in acquiring some knowledge of the Crustaceans, as this was of service when in after years I undertook a monograph of the Cirripedia.

During some part of the day I wrote my Journal, and took much pains in describing carefully and vividly all that I had seen; and this was good practice. My Journal served, also, in part as letters to my home, and portions were sent to England, whenever there was an opportunity.

The above various special studies were, however, of no importance compared with the habit of energetic industry and of concentrated attention to whatever I was engaged in, which I then acquired. Everything about which I thought or read was made to bear directly on what I had seen and was likely to see; and this habit of mind was continued during the five years of the voyage. I feel sure that it was this training which has enabled me to do whatever I have done in science.
Looking backwards, I can now perceive how my love for science gradually preponderated over every other taste. During the first two years my old passion for shooting survived in nearly full force, and I shot myself all the birds and animals for my collection; but gradually I gave up my gun more and more, and finally altogether to my servant, as shooting interfered with my work, more especially with making out the geological structure of a country. I discovered, though unconsciously and insensibly, that the pleasure of observing and reasoning was a much higher one than that of skill and sport. The primeval instincts of the barbarian slowly yielded to the acquired tastes of the civilized man. That my mind became developed through my pursuits during the voyage, is rendered probable by a remark made by my father, who was the most acute observer whom I ever saw, of a sceptical disposition, and far from being a believer in phrenology; for on first seeing me after the voyage, he turned round to my sisters and exclaimed, “Why, the shape of his head is quite altered.”

As far as I can judge of myself I worked to the utmost during the voyage from the mere pleasure of investigation, and from my strong desire to add a few facts to the great mass of facts in natural science. But I was also ambitious to take a fair place among scientific men,—whether more ambitious or less so than most of my fellow-workers I can form no opinion.

Towards the close of our voyage I received a letter whilst at Ascension, in which my sisters told me that Sedgwick had called on my father and said that I should take a place among the leading scientific men. I could not at the time understand how he could have learnt anything of my proceedings, but I heard (I believe afterwards) that Henslow had read some of the letters which I wrote to him before the Philosophical Soc. of Cambridge? and had printed them for private distribution. My collection of fossil bones, which had been sent to Henslow, also excited considerable attention amongst palaeontologists. After reading this letter I clambered over the mountains of Ascension with a bounding step and made the volcanic rocks resound under my geological hammer! All this shows how ambitious I was; but I think that I can say with truth that in after years, though I cared in the highest degree for the approbation of such men as Lyell and Hooker, who were my friends, I did not care much about the general public. I do not mean to say that a favourable review or a large sale of my books did not please me greatly; but the pleasure was a fleeting one, and I am sure that I have never turned one inch out of my course to gain fame.

Questions:
1. Where does Darwin receive his education (both formally and informally)?
2. What does he consider to be the most useful and the least useful? Why?
3. What kind of educational system do you think he would like to see? How does this fit with other ideas you have learned about in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries?
4. How do his views of education fit with ideas today?
24.3 Sexual Science?

Krafft-Ebing, a Viennese physician and professor, wrote *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1886), called “the first classic in sexual science.” To emphasize its scientific nature (it was designed for doctors and the highly educated), it had a scientific title, technical terms, and Latin for the more exciting passages. Nevertheless, the work was reprinted many times and translated into many languages. The first to describe many sexual practices, Krafft-Ebing argued that denial of the sexual instinct caused psychopathic and nervous conditions in men and women. He also was one of the first to classify sexual behavior according to a variety of pathologies.


The propagation of the human race is not left to mere accident or the caprices of the individual, but is guaranteed by the hidden laws of nature which are enforced by a mighty, irresistible impulse. Sensual enjoyment and physical fitness are not the only conditions for the enforcement of these laws, but higher motives and aims, such as the desire to continue the species or the individuality of mental and physical qualities beyond time and space, exert a considerable influence. Man puts himself at once on a level with the beast if he seeks to gratify lust alone, but he elevates his superior position when by curbing the animal desire he combines with the sexual functions ideas of morality, of the sublime, and the beautiful.

Placed upon this lofty pedestal he stands far above nature and draws from inexhaustible sources material for nobler enjoyments, for serious work and for the realisation of ideal aims. Maudsley (“Deutsche Klinik,” 1873, 2, 3) justly claims that sexual feeling is the basis upon which social advancement is developed.

If man were deprived of sexual distinction and the nobler enjoyments arising therefrom, all poetry and probably all moral tendency would be eliminated from his life.

Sexual life no doubt is the one mighty factor in the individual and social relations of man which disclose his powers of activity, of acquiring property, of establishing a home, of awakening altruistic sentiments towards a person of the opposite sex, and towards his own issue as well as towards the whole human race.

Sexual feeling is really the root of all ethics, and no doubt of aestheticism and religion.

The sublimest virtues, even the sacrifice of self, may spring from sexual life, which, however, on account of its sensual power, may easily degenerate into the lowest passion and basest vice.

Love unbridled is a volcano that burns down and lays waste all around it; it is an abyss that devours all—honour, substance and health.

It is of great psychological interest to follow up the gradual development of civilisation and time influence exerted by sexual life upon habits and morality. The gratification of the sexual instinct seems to be the primary motive in man as well as in beast. Sexual intercourse is done openly, and man and woman are not ashamed of their nakedness. The savage races, *e.g.*, Australasians, Polynesians, Malays of the Philippines are still in this stage (*vide* Ploss). Woman is the common property of man, the spoil of the strongest and mightiest, who chooses the most winsome for his own, a sort of instinctive sexual selection of the fittest.

Woman is a “chattel,” an article of commerce, exchange or gift, a vessel for sensual gratification, an implement for toil. The presence of shame in the manifestations and exercise of the sexual functions, and of modesty in the mutual relations between the sexes are the foundations of morality. Thence arises the desire to cover the nakedness: (“and they saw that they were naked”) and to perform the act in private.

The development of this grade of civilisation is furthered by the conditions of frigid climes which necessitate the protection of the whole body against the cold. It is an anthropological fact that modesty can be traced to much earlier periods among northern races.

Another element which tends to promote the refined development of sexual life is the fact that woman ceases to be a “chattel”. She becomes an individual being, and, although socially still far below man, she gradually acquires rights, independence of action, and the privilege to bestow her favours where she inclines. She is wooed by man. Traces of ethical sentiments pervade the rude sensual appetite, idealisation begins and community of woman ceases. The sexes are drawn to each other by mental and physical merits and exchange favours of preference. In this stage woman is conscious of the fact that her charms belong only to the man of her choice. She seeks to hide them from others. This forms the foundation of modesty, chastity and sexual fidelity so long as love endures.

This development is hastened wherever nomadic habits yield to the spirit of colonisation, where man establishes a household. He feels the necessity for a companion in life, a housewife in a settled home.
V. PATHOLOGICAL SEXUALITY IN ITS LEGAL ASPECTS

The laws of all civilised nations punish those who commit perverse sexual acts. Inasmuch as the preservation of chastity and morals is one of the most important reasons for the existence of the commonwealth, the state cannot be too careful, as a protector of morality, in the struggle against sensuality. This contest is unequal; because only a certain number of the sexual crimes can be legally combatted, and the infractions of the laws by so powerful a natural instinct can be but little influenced by punishment. It also lies in the nature of the sexual crimes that but a part of them ever reach the knowledge of the authorities. Public sentiment, in that it looks upon them as disgraceful, lends much aid.

Criminal statistics prove the sad fact that sexual crimes are progressively increasing in our modern civilisation. This is particularly the case with unmoral acts with children under the age of fourteen.

Casper (Clinical novels), drew attention to this deplorable fact early in the sixties of the 19th century. As a criminal physician (Berlin) he had fifty-two cases of crimes against morality under observation from 1842–57, but during the decade of 1852–1861 the number rose to 138.

[... more statistics follow]

The moralist sees in these sad facts nothing but the decay of general morality, and in some instances comes to the conclusion that the present mildness of the laws punishing sexual crimes, in comparison with their severity in past centuries, is in part responsible for this.

The medical investigator is driven to the conclusion that this manifestation of modern social life stands in relation to the predominating nervous condition of later generations, in that it begets defective individuals, excites the sexual instinct, leads to sexual abuse, and, with continuance of lasciviousness associated with diminished sexual power, induces perverse sexual acts.

It will be clearly seen from what follows how such an opinion is justified, especially with respect of the increasing number of sexual crimes committed on children.

The relative increase of sexual delicts on children seems to point to an advance in the physical decadence (impotence) and psychical degeneration of the adult population.

Psychiatry cannot be denied the credit of having recognised and proved the psycho-pathological significance of numerous monstrous, paradoxical sexual acts.

Law and Jurisprudence have thus far given but little attention to the facts resulting from investigations in psychopathology. Law is, in this, opposed to Medicine, and is constantly in danger of passing judgment on individuals who, in the light of science, are not responsible for their acts.

Owing to this superficial treatment of acts that deeply concern the interests and welfare of society, it becomes very easy for justice to treat a delinquent, who is as dangerous to society as a murderer or a wild beast, as a criminal, and, after punishment, release him to prey on society again; on the other hand, scientific investigation shows that a man mentally and sexually degenerate ab origine, and therefore irresponsible, must be removed from society for life, but not as a punishment.

A judge who considers only the crime, and not its perpetrator, is always in danger of injuring not only important interests of society (general morality and safety), but also those of time individual (honour).

In no domain of criminal law is co-operation of judge and medical expert so much to be desired as in that of sexual delinquencies; and here only anthropological and clinical investigation can afford light and knowledge.

The nature of the act can never, in itself, determine a decision as to whether it lies within the limits of mental pathology, or within the bounds of mental physiology. The perverse act does not per se indicate perversion of instinct. At any rate, the most monstrous and most perverse sexual acts have been committed by persons of sound mind. The perversion of feeling must be shown to be pathological. This proof is to be obtained by learning the conditions attending its development, and by proving it to be part of an existing general neuropathic or psychopathic condition.

The species facti is important; but it, too, allows only presumptions, since the same sexual act, according as it is committed by an epileptic, paralytic, or a man of sound mind, takes on other features and peculiarities, in accordance with the manner in which it is done.
Periodical recurrence of the act under identical circumstances, and an impulsive manner in carrying it out, give rise to weighty presumptions that it is of pathological significance. The decision, however, must follow after referring the act to its psychological motive (abnormalities of thought and feeling), and after showing this elementary anomaly to be but one symptom of a general neuropathic condition—either an arrest of mental development, or a condition of psychical degeneration, or a psychosis.

The cases discussed in the portion of this work devoted to general and special pathology will certainly be useful to the medical expert, in assisting him to discover the motive of the act.

To obtain the facts necessary to allow a decision of the question whether immorality or abnormality occasioned the act, a medico-legal examination is required—an examination which is made according to the rules of science; which takes account of both the past history of the individual and the present condition,—the anthropological and clinical data.

Questions:
1. How does Krafft-Ebing characterize sexuality?
2. How does he link it to the development of people?
3. How might this argument support imperialism (see Chapter 23)?
4. What argument does he make about sexual behavior and criminality?
5. What does this argument support in terms of government action?
Part 24: Nineteenth-Century Thought

24.4 Auguste Comte: from *The Age of Ideology*

The French philosopher Auguste Comte (1798–1857) was the founder of positivism. According to positivists, the only valid knowledge is scientific knowledge. In the excerpt from his writings included here, Comte related the “Positive Philosophy” to human and historical development.


A general state of any system of philosophy may be either a sketch of a doctrine to be established, or a summary of a doctrine already established. If greater value belongs to the last, the first is still important, as characterizing from its origin the subject to be treated. In a case like the present, where the proposed study is vast and hitherto indeterminate, it is especially important that the field of research should be marked out with all possible accuracy. For this purpose, I will glance at the considerations which have originated this work, and which will be fully elaborated in the course of it.

In order to understand the true value and character of the Positive Philosophy, we must take a brief general view of the progressive course of the human mind, regarded as a whole; for no conception can be understood otherwise than through its history.

*Law of human progress.*—From the study of the development of human intelligence, in all directions, and through all times, the discovery arises of a great fundamental law, to which it is necessarily subject, and which has a solid foundation of proof, both in the facts of our organization and in our historical experience. The law is this:—that each of our leading conceptions,—each branch of our knowledge,—pass successively through three different theoretical, conditions: the Theological, or fictitious; the metaphysical, or abstract; and the Scientific, or positive. In other words, the human mind, by its nature, employs in its progress three methods of philosophizing, the character of which is essentially different, and even radically opposed: viz., the theological method, the metaphysical, and the positive. Hence arise three philosophies, or general systems of conceptions on the aggregate of phenomena, each of which excludes the others. The first is the necessary point of departure of the human understanding; and the third is its fixed and definitive state. The second is merely a state of transition.

*First stage.*—In the theological state, the human mind, seeking the essential nature of beings, the first and final causes (the origin and purpose) of all effects,—in short, Absolute knowledge,—supposes all phenomena to be produced by the immediate action of supernatural beings.

*Second stage.*—In the metaphysical state, which is only a modification of the first, the mind supposes, instead of supernatural beings, abstract forces, veritable entities (that is, personified abstractions) inherent in all beings, and capable of producing all phenomena. What is called the explanation of phenomena is, in this stage, a mere reference of each to its proper entity.

*Third stage.*—In the final, the positive state, the mind has given over the vain search after Absolute notions, the origin and destination of the universe, and the causes of phenomena, and applies itself to the study of their laws,—that is, their invariable relations of succession and resemblance. Reasoning and observation, duly combined, are the means of this knowledge. What is now understood when we speak of an explanation of facts is simply the establishment of a connection between single phenomena and some general facts, the number of which continually diminishes with the progress of science.

*Ultimate point of each.*—The Theological system arrived at the highest perfection of which it is capable when it substituted the providential action of a single Being for the varied operations of the numerous divinities which had been before imagined. In the same way, in the last stage of the Metaphysical system, men substitute one great entity (Nature) as the cause of all phenomena, instead of the multitude of entities at first supposed. In the same way, again, the ultimate perfection of the Positive system would be (if such perfection could be hoped for) to represent all phenomena as particular aspects of a single general fact:—such as Gravitation, for instance.

The importance of the working of this general law will be established hereafter. At present, it must suffice to point out some of the grounds of it.

*Evidences of the law. Actual.*—There is no science which, having attained the positive stage, does not bear marks of having passed through the others. Some time since it was (whatever it might be) composed as we can now perceive, of metaphysical abstractions; and, further back in the course of time, it took its form from theological conceptions. We shall have only too much occasion to see, as we proceed, that our most advanced sciences still bear very evident marks of the two earlier periods through which they have passed.
The progress of the individual mind is not only an illustration, but an indirect evidence of that of the general mind. The point of departure of the individual and of the race being the same, the phases of the mind of a man correspond to the epochs of the mind of the race. Now, each of us is aware, if he looks back upon his own history, that he was a theologian in his childhood, a metaphysician in his youth, and a natural philosopher in his manhood. All men who are up to their age can verify this for themselves.

**Theoretical.**—Besides the observation of facts, we have theoretical reasons in support of this law.

The most important of these reasons arises from the necessity that always exists for some theory to which to refer our facts, combined with the clear impossibility that, at the outset of human knowledge, men could have formed theories out of the observation of facts. All good intellects have repeated, since Bacon's time, that there can be no real knowledge but that which is based on observed facts. This is incontestable, in our present advanced stage; but, if we look back to the primitive stage of human knowledge, we shall see that it must have been otherwise then. If it is true that every theory must be based upon observed facts, it is equally true that facts cannot be observed without the guidance of some theory. Without such guidance, our facts would be desolatory and fruitless; we could not retain them: for the most part we could not even perceive them.

Thus, between the necessity of observing facts in order to form a theory, and having theory in order to observe facts, the human mind would have been entangled in a vicious circle, but for the natural opening afforded by Theological conceptions. This is the fundamental reason for the theological character of the primitive philosophy. This necessity is confirmed by the perfect suitability of the theological philosophy to the earliest researchers of the human mind. It is remarkable that the most inaccessible questions,—those of the nature of beings, and the origin and purpose of phenomena,—should be the first to occur in a primitive state, while those which are really within our reach are regarded as almost unworthy of serious study. The reason is evident enough:—that experience alone can teach us the measure of our powers; and if men had not begun by an exaggerated estimate of what they can do, they would never have done all that they are capable of. Our organization requires this. At such a period there could have been no reception of a positive philosophy, whose function is to discover the laws of phenomena, and whose leading characteristic it is to regard as interdicted to human reason those sublime mysteries which theology explains, even to their minutest details, with the most attractive facility. It is just so under a practical view of the nature of the researchers with which men first occupied themselves. Such inquiries offered the powerful charm of unlimited empire over the external world,—a world destined wholly for our use, and involved in every way with our existence. The theological philosophy, presenting this view, administered exactly the stimulus necessary to incite the human mind to the irksome labour without which it could make no progress. We can scarcely conceive of such a state of things, our reasons having become sufficiently mature to enter upon laborious scientific researchers, without needing any such stimulus as wrought upon the imaginations of astrologers and alchemists. We have motive enough in the hope of discovering the laws of phenomena, with a view to the confirmation or rejection of a theory. But it could not be so in the earliest days; and it is to the chimeras of astrology and alchemy that we owe the long series of observations and experiments on which our positive science is based. Kepler felt this on behalf of astronomy, and Berthollet on behalf of chemistry. Thus was a spontaneous philosophy, the theological, the only possible beginning, method, and provisional system, out of which the Positive philosophy could grow. It is easy, after this, to perceive how Metaphysical methods and doctrines must have afforded the means of transition from one to the other.

The human understanding, slow in its advance, could not step at once from the theological into the positive philosophy. The two are so radically opposed, that an intermediate system of conceptions has been necessary to render the transition possible. It is only in doing this, that Metaphysical conceptions have any utility whatever. In contemplating phenomena, men substitute for supernatural direction a corresponding entity. This entity may have been supposed to be derived from the supernatural action: but it is more easily lost sight of, leaving attention free for the facts themselves, till, at length, metaphysical agents have ceased to be anything more than the abstract names of phenomena. It is not easy to say by what other process than this our minds could have passed from supernatural considerations to natural; from the theological system to the positive.

The Law of human development being thus established, let us consider what is the proper nature of the Positive Philosophy.

**Character of the Positive Philosophy.**—As we have seen, the first characteristic of the Positive Philosophy is that it regards all phenomena as subjected to invariable natural Laws. Our business is,—seeing how vain is any research into what are called Causes, whether first or final,—to pursue an accurate discovery of these Laws, with a view to reducing them to the smallest possible number. By speculating upon causes, we could solve no difficulty about origin and purpose. Our real business is to analyse accurately the circumstances of phenomena, and to connect them by the natural relations of succession and resemblance. The best illustration of this is in the case of the doctrine of Gravitation. We say that the general phenomena of the universe are explained by it, because it connects under one head the whole immense variety of astronomical facts; exhibiting the constant tendency of atoms towards each other in direct proportion of their masses, and in inverse proportion to the squares of their distances; whilst the general fact itself is a mere extension of one which is per-
To review the philosophy of the Sciences.—The purpose of this work is not to give an account of the Natural Sciences. Besides that it would be endless, and that it would require a scientific preparation such as no one man possesses, it would be apart from our object, which is to go through a course of not Positive Science, but Positive Philosophy. We have only to consider each fundamental science in its relation to the whole positive system, and to the spirit which characterizes it; that is, with regard to its methods and its chief results.
The two aims, though distinct, are inseparable; for, on the one hand, there can be no positive philosophy without a basis of social science, without which it could not be all-comprehensive; and, on the other hand, we could not pursue Social science without having been prepared by the study of phenomena less complicated than those of society, and furnished with a knowledge of laws and an interior facts which have a bearing upon social science. Though the fundamental sciences are not all equally interesting to ordinary minds, there is no one of them that can be neglected in an inquiry like the present; and, in the eye of philosophy, all are of equal value to human welfare. Even those which appear the least interesting have their own value, either on account of the perfection of their methods, or as being the necessary basis of all the others.

Advantages of the Positive Philosophy.—The general spirit of a course of Positive philosophy having been thus set forth, we must now glance at the chief advantages which may be derived, on behalf of human progression, from the study of it. Of these advantages, four may be especially pointed out.

Illustrates the intellectual function.—I. The study of the Positive Philosophy affords the only rational means of exhibiting the logical laws of the human mind, which have hitherto been sought by unfit methods. To explain what is meant by this, we may refer to a saying of M. de Blainville, in his work on Comparative Anatomy, that every active, and especially every living being, may be regarded under two relations—the Statical and the Dynamical; that is, under conditions or in action. It is clear that all considerations range themselves under the one or the other of these heads. Let us apply this classification to the intellectual functions.

If we regard these functions under their Statical aspect—that is, if we consider the conditions under which they exist—we must determine the organic circumstances of the case, which inquiry involves it with anatomy and physiology. If we look at the Dynamic aspect, we have to study simply the exercise and results of the intellectual powers of the human race, which is neither more nor less than the general object of the Positive Philosophy. In short, looking at all scientific theories as so many great logical facts, it is only by the thorough observation of these facts that we can arrive at the knowledge of logical laws. These being the only means of knowledge of intellectual phenomena, the illusory psychology, which is the last phase of theology, is excluded. It pretends to accomplish the discovery of the laws of the human mind by contemplating it in itself; that is, by separating it from causes and effects. Such an attempt, made in defiance of the physiological study of our intellectual organs, and of the observation of rational methods of procedure, cannot succeed at this time of day.

The Positive Philosophy, which has been rising since the time of Bacon, has now secured such a preponderance, that the metaphysicians themselves profess to ground their pretended science on an observation of facts. They talk of external and internal facts, and say that their business is with the latter. This is much like saying that vision is explained by luminous objects painting their images upon the retina. To this the physiologists reply that another eye would be needed to see the image. In the same manner, the mind may observe all phenomena but its own. It may be said that a man’s intellect may observe his passions, the seat of the reason being somewhat apart from that of the emotions in the brain; but there can be nothing like scientific observation of the passions, except from without, as the stir of the emotions disturbs the observing faculties more or less. It is yet more out of the question to make an intellectual observation of intellectual processes. The observing and observed organ are here the same, and its action cannot be pure and natural. In order to observe, your intellect must pause from activity; yet it is this very activity that you want to observe. If you cannot effect the pause, you cannot observe: if you do effect it, there is nothing to observe. The results of such a method are in proportion to its absurdity. After two thousand years of psychological pursuit, no one proposition is established to the satisfaction of its followers. They are divided, to this day, into a multitude of schools, still disputing about the very elements of their doctrine. This interior observation gives birth to almost as many theories as there are observers. We ask in vain for any one discovery, great or small, which has been made under this method. The psychologists have done some good in keeping up the activity of our understandings, when there was no better work for our faculties to do; and they may have added something to our stock of knowledge. If they have done so, it is by practising the Positive method—by observing the progress of the human mind in the light of science; that is, by ceasing, for the moment, to be psychologists.

The view just given in relation to logical science becomes yet more striking when we consider the logical Art. The Positive Method can be judged of only in action. It cannot be looked at by itself, apart from the work on which it is employed. At all events, such a contemplation would be only a dead study, which could produce nothing in the mind which loses time upon it. We may talk for ever about the method, and state it in terms very wisely, without knowing half so much about it as the man who has once put it in practice upon a single particular of actual research, even without any philosophical intention. Thus it is that psychologists, by dint of reading the precepts of Bacon and the discourses of Descartes, have mistaken their own dreams for science.
Without saying whether it will ever be possible to establish *à priori* a true method of investigation, independent of a philosophical study of the sciences, it is clear that the thing has never been done yet, and that we are not capable of doing it now. We cannot as yet explain the great logical procedures, apart from their applications. If we ever do, it will remain as necessary then as now to form good intellectual habits by studying the regular application of the scientific methods which we shall have attained.

This, then, is the first great result of the Positive Philosophy—the manifestation by experiment of the laws which rule the Intellect in their investigation of truth; and, as a consequence, the knowledge of the general rules suitable for that object.

**Must regenerate Education.**—II. The second effect of the Positive Philosophy, an effect not less important and far more urgently wanted, will be to regenerate Education.

The best minds are agreed that our European education, still essentially theological, metaphysical, and literary, must be superseded by a Positive training, conformable to our time and needs. Even the governments of our day have shared, where they have not originated, the attempts to establish positive instruction; and this is a striking indication of the prevalent sense of what is wanted. While encouraging such endeavours to the utmost, we must not however conceal from ourselves that everything yet done is inadequate to the object. The present exclusive specialty of our pursuits, and the consequent isolation of the sciences, spoil our teaching. . . . The specialties of science can be pursued by those whose vocation lies in that direction. They are indispensable; and they are not likely to be neglected; but they can never of themselves renovate our system of Education; and, to be of their full use, they must rest upon the basis of that general instructions which is a direct result of the Positive Philosophy.

**Must reorganize society.**—IV. The Positive Philosophy offers the only solid basis for that Social Reorganization which must succeed the critical condition in which the most civilized nations are now living.

It cannot be necessary to prove to anybody who reads this work that Ideas govern the world, or throw it into chaos; in other words, that all social mechanism rests upon Opinions. The great political and moral crisis that societies are now undergoing is shown by a rigid analysis to arise out of intellectual anarchy. While stability in fundamental maxims is the first condition of genuine social order, we are suffering under an utter disagreement which may be called universal. Till a certain number of general ideas can be acknowledged as a rallying-point of social doctrine, the nations will remain in a revolutionary state, whatever palliatives may be devised; and their institutions can be only provisional. But whenever the necessary agreement on first principles can be obtained, appropriate institutions will issue from them, without shock or resistance; for the causes of disorder will have been arrested by the mere fact of the agreement. It is in this direction that those must look who desire a natural and regular, a normal state of society.

Now, the existing disorder is abundantly accounted for by the existence, all at once, of three incompatible philosophies,—the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive. Any one of these might alone secure some sort of social order; but while the three co-exist, it is impossible for us to understand one another upon any essential point whatever. If this is true, we have only to ascertain which of the philosophies must, in the nature of things, prevail; and, this ascertained, every man, whatever may have been his former views, cannot but concur in its triumph. The problem once recognized cannot remain long unsolved; for all considerations whatever point to the Positive Philosophy as the one destined to prevail. It alone has been advancing during a course of centuries, throughout which the others have been declining. The fact is incontestable. Some may deplore it, but none can destroy it, nor therefore neglect it but under penalty of being betrayed by illusory speculations. This general revolution of the human mind is nearly accomplished. We have only to complete the Positive Philosophy by bringing Social phenomena within its comprehension, and afterwards consolidating the whole into one body of homogeneous doctrine. The marked preference which almost all minds, from the highest to the commonest, accord to positive knowledge over vague and mystical conceptions, is a pledge of what the reception of this philosophy will be when it has acquired the only quality that it now wants—a character of due generality. When it has become complete, its supremacy will take place spontaneously, and will re-establish order throughout society. There is, at present, no conflict but between the theological and the metaphysical philosophies. They are contending for the task of reorganizing society; but it is a work too mighty for either of them. The positive philosophy has hitherto intervened only to examine both, and both are abundantly discredited by the process. It is time now to be doing something more effective, without wasting our forces in needless controversy. It is time to complete the vast intellectual operations begun by Bacon, Descartes, and Galileo, by constructing the system of general ideas which must henceforth prevail among the human race. This is the way to put an end to the revolutionary crisis which is tormenting the civilized nations of the world.

Leaving these four points of advantage, we must attend to one precautionary reflection.
No hope of reduction to a single law.—Because it is proposed to consolidate the whole of our acquired knowledge into one body of homogeneous doctrine, it must not be supposed that we are going to study this vast variety as proceeding from a single principle, and as subjected to a single law. There is something so chimerical in attempts at universal explanation by a single law, that it may be as well to secure this Work at once from any imputation of the kind, though its development will show how undeserved such an imputation would be. Our intellectual resources are too narrow, and the universe is too complex, to leave any hope that it will ever be within our power to carry scientific perfection to its last degree of simplicity. Moreover, it appears as if the value of such an attainment, supposing it possible, were greatly overrated. . . .

The consideration of all phenomena as referable to a single origin is by no means necessary to the systematic formation of science, any more than to the realization of the great and happy consequences that we anticipate from the positive philosophy. The only necessary unity is that of Method, which is already in great part established. As for the doctrine, it need not be one; it is enough that it should be homogeneous. It is, then, under the double aspect of unity of method and homogeneity of doctrine that we shall consider the different classes of positive theories in this work. While pursuing the philosophical aim of all science, the lessening of the number of general laws requisite for the explanation of natural phenomena, we shall regard as presumptuous every attempt, in all future time, to reduce them rigorously to one.

Question:
1. How can the individual mind “illustrate” the general mind? What is the highest function of the mind?
24.5 Friedrich Nietzsche: from The Age of Ideology

Collectively, Friedrich Nietzsche’s (1844–1900) writings are a fierce rejection of Western civilization. Disgusted by middle-class Christian morality, Nietzsche sought a new basis for moral action centered on superior individuals, “supermen.” In the decades after his death, the Nazis offered distorted versions of Nietzsche’s writings in support of their own political philosophy.

Source: Beyond Good and Evil, authorized translation by Helen Zimmern. Edinburgh: The Good European Society, The Darien Press, 1907, pp. 5–12 and 20–34. The original title of this work was Jenseits von Gut und Böse; it was first published in 1886.

[1. The Will to Truth, which is to tempt us to many a hazardous enterprise, the famous Truthfulness of which all philosophers have hitherto spoken with respect, what questions has this Will to Truth not laid before us! What strange, perplexing, questionable questions! It is already a long story; yet it seems as if it were hardly commenced. Is it any wonder if we at last grow distrustful, lose patience, and turn impatiently away? That this Sphinx teaches us at last to ask questions ourselves? Who is it really that puts questions to us here? What really is this “Will to Truth” in us? In fact we made a long halt at the question as to the origin of this Will—until at last we came to an absolute standstill before a yet more fundamental question. We inquired about the value of this Will. Granted that we want the truth: why not rather untruth? And uncertainty? Even ignorance? The problem of the value of truth presented itself before us—or was it we who presented ourselves before the problem? Which of us is the Oedipus here? Which the Sphinx? It would seem to be a rendezvous of questions and notes of interrogation. And could it be believed that it at last seems to us as if the problem had never been propounded before, as if we were the first to discern it, get a sight of it, and risk raising it. For there is risk in raising it, perhaps there is no greater risk.

2. “How could anything originate out of its opposite? For example, truth out of error? or the Will to Truth out of the will to deception? or the generous deed out of selfishness? or the pure sun-bright vision of the wise man out of covetousness? Such genesis is impossible; whoever dreams of it is a fool, nay, worse than a fool; things of the highest value must have a different origin, an origin of their own—in this transitory, seductive, illusory, paltry world, in this turmoil of delusion and cupidity, they cannot have their source. But rather in the lap of Being, in the intransitory, in the concealed God, in the “Thing-in-itself”—there must be their source, and nowhere else!”—This mode of reasoning discloses the typical prejudice by which metaphysicians of all times can be recognised, this mode of valuation is at the back of all their logical procedure; through this “belief” of theirs, they exert themselves for their “knowledge,” for something that is in the end solemnly christened “the Truth.” The fundamental belief of metaphysicians is the belief in antitheses of values. It never occurred even to the warmest of them to doubt here on the very threshold (where doubt, however, was most necessary); though they had made a solemn vow, “de omnibus dubitandum.” For it may be doubted, firstly, whether antitheses exist occurred even to the wariest of them to doubt here on the very threshold (where doubt, however, was most necessary); and secondly, whether the popular valuations and antitheses of value upon which metaphysicians have set their seal, are not perhaps merely superficial estimates, merely provisional perspectives, besides being probably made from some corner, perhaps from below—“frog perspectives,” as it were, to borrow an expression current among painters. In spite of all the value which may belong to the true, the positive, and the unselfish, it might be possible that a higher and more fundamental value for life generally should be assigned to pretence, to the will to delusion, to selfishness, and cupidity. It might even be possible that what constitutes the value of those good and respected things, consists precisely in their being insidiously related, knotted, and crocheted to these evil and apparently opposed things—perhaps even in being essentially identical with them. Perhaps! But who wishes to concern himself with such dangerous “Perhapses”! For that investigation one must await the advent of a new order of philosophers, such as will have other tastes and inclinations, the reverse of those hitherto prevalent—philosophers of the dangerous “Perhaps” in every sense of the term. And to speak in all seriousness, I see such new philosophers beginning to appear.

3. Having kept a sharp eye on philosophers, and having read between their lines long enough, I now say to myself that the greater part of conscious thinking must be counted amongst the instinctive functions, and it is so even in the case of philosophical thinking; one has here to learn anew, as one learned anew about heredity and “ineptness.” As little as the act of birth comes into consideration in the whole process and continuation of heredity, just as little is “being-conscious” opposed to the instinctive in any decisive sense; the greater part of the conscious thinking of a philosopher is secretly influenced by his instincts, and forced into definite channels. And behind all logic and its seeming sovereignty of movement, there are valuations, or to speak more plainly, physiological demands, for the maintenance of a definite mode of life. . . .

4. The falseness of an opinion is not for us any objection to it: it is here, perhaps, that our new language sounds most strangely. The question is, how far an opinion is life-furthering, life-preserving, species-preserving, perhaps species-rearing; and we are fundamentally inclined to maintain that the falsest opinions (to which the synthetic judgments a priori belong), are the most indispensable to us; that without a recognition of logical fictions, without a comparison of reality with
the purely imagined world of the absolute and immutable, without a constant counterfeiting of the world by means of numbers, man could not live—that the renunciation of false opinions would be a renunciation of life, a negation of life. To recognise untruth as a condition of life: that is certainly to impugn the traditional ideas of value in a dangerous manner, and a philosophy which ventures to do so, has thereby alone placed itself beyond good and evil.

5. That which causes philosophers to be regarded half-distrustfully and half-mockingly, is not the oft-repeated discover how innocent they are—how often and easily they make mistakes and lose their way, in short, how childish and childlike they are,—but that there is not enough honest dealing with them, whereas they all raise a loud and virtuous outcry when the problem of truthfulness is even hinted at in the remotest manner. They all pose as though their real opinions had been discovered and attained through the self-evolving of a cold, pure, divinely indifferent dialectic (in contrast to all sorts of mystics, who, fairer and foolisher, talk of “inspiration”); whereas, in fact, a prejudiced proposition, idea, or “suggestion,” which is generally their heart’s desire abstracted and refined, is defended by them with arguments sought out after the event. They are all advocates who do not wish to be regarded as such, generally astute defenders, also, of their prejudices, which they dub “truths,”—and very far from having the conscience’ which bravely admits this to itself; very far from having the good taste or the courage which goes so far as to let this be understood, perhaps to warn friend or foe, or in cheerful confidence and self-ridicule. The spectacle of the Tartuffery of old Kant, equally stiff and decent, with which he entices us into the dialectic by-ways that lead (more correctly mislead) to his “categorical imperative”—makes us fastidious ones smile, we who find no small amusement in spying out the subtle tricks of old moralists and ethical preachers. Or, stiff more so, the hocus-pocus of mathematical form, by means of which Spinoza has as it were clad his philosophy in mail and mask—in fact, the “love of his wisdom,” to translate the term fairly and squarely—in order thereby to strike terror at once into the heart of the assailant who should dare to cast a glance on that invincible maiden, that Pallas Athene:—how much of personal timidity and vulnerability does this masquerade of a sickly recluse betray!

6. It has gradually become clear to me what every great philosophy up till now has consisted of—namely, the confession of its originator, and a species of involuntary and unconscious autobiography: and moreover that the moral (or immoral) purpose in every philosophy has constituted the true vital germ out of which the entire plant has always grown. Indeed, to understand how the abstrusest metaphysical assertions of a philosopher have been arrived at, it is always well (and wise) to first ask oneself: “What morality do they (or does he) aim at?” Accordingly, I do not believe that an “impulse to knowledge” is the father of philosophy; but that another impulse, here as elsewhere, has only made use of knowledge (and mistaken knowledge!) as an instrument. But whoever considers the fundamental impulses of man with a view to determining how far they may have here acted as inspiring genii (or as demons and kobolds), will find that they have all practised philosophy at one time or another, and that each one of them would have been only too glad to look upon itself as the ultimate end of existence and the legitimate lord over all the other impulses. For every impulse is imperious, and as such, attempts to philosophise. To be sure, in the case of scholars, in the case of really scientific men, it may be otherwise—better, if you will; there may really be such a thing as an “impulse to knowledge,” some kind of small, independent clockwork, which, when well wound up, works away industriously to that end, without the rest of the scholarly impulses taking any material part therein. The actual “interests” of the scholar, therefore, are generally in quite another direction—in the family, perhaps, or in money-making, or in politics; it is, in fact, almost indifferent at what point of research his little machine is placed, and whether the hopeful young worker becomes a good philologist, a mushroom specialist, or a chemist; he is not characterised by becoming this or that. In the philosopher, on the contrary, there is absolutely nothing impersonal; and above all, his morality furnishes a decided and decisive testimony as to who he is,—that is to say, in what order the deepest impulses of his nature stand to each other.

13. Psychologists should bethink themselves before putting down the instinct of self-preservation as the cardinal instinct of an organic being. A living thing seeks above all to discharge its strength—life itself is Will to Power; self-preservation is only one of the indirect and most frequent results thereof. In short, here, as everywhere else, let us beware of superficial teleological principles!—one of which is the instinct of self-preservation (we owe it to Spinoza’s inconsistency). It is thus, in effect, that method ordains, which must be essentially economy of principles.

16. There are still harmless self-observers who believe that there are “immediate certainties”; for instance or as the superstition of Schopenhauer puts it, “I will”; as though cognition here got hold of its object purely and simply as “the thing in itself,” without any falsification taking place either on the part of the subject or the object. I would repeat it, however, a hundred times, that “immediate certainty,” as well as “absolute knowledge” and the “thing in itself,” involve a contradicito in adjecto; we really ought to free ourselves from the misleading significance of words! The people on their part may think that cognition is knowing all about things, but the philosopher must say to himself: “When I analyse the process that is expressed in the sentence, ‘I think,’ I find a whole series of daring assertions, the argumentative proof of which would be difficult, perhaps impossible: for instance, that it is I who think, that there must necessarily be something that thinks, that thinking is an activity and operation on the part of a being who is thought of as a cause, that there is an ‘ego,’ and finally, that it is already determined what is to be designated by thinking—that I know what thinking is. For if I had not already
decided within myself what it is, by what standard could I determine whether that which is just happening is not perhaps ‘willing’ or ‘feeling’? In short, the assertion ‘I think,’ assumes that I compare my state at the present moment with other states of myself which I know, in order to determine what it is; on account of this retrospective connection with further ‘knowledge,’ it has at any rate no immediate certainty for me.” — In place of the “immediate certainty” in which the people may believe in the special case, the philosopher thus finds a series of metaphysical questions presented to him, veritable conscience questions of the intellect, to wit: “From whence did I get the notion of ‘thinking’? Why do I believe in cause and effect? What gives me the right to speak of an ‘ego,’ and even of an ‘ego’ as cause, and finally of an ‘ego’ as cause of thought?” He who ventures to answer these metaphysical questions at once by an appeal to a sort of intuitive perception, like the person who says, “I think, and know that this, at least, is true, actual, and certain”—will encounter a smile and two notes of interrogation in a philosopher nowadays. “Sir,” the philosopher will perhaps give him to understand, “it is improbable that you are not mistaken, but why should it be the truth?”

17. With regard to the superstitions of logicians, I shall never tire of emphasising, a small, terse fact, which is unwillingly recognised by these credulous minds—namely, that a thought comes when “it” wishes, and not when “I” wish; so that it is a perversion of the facts of the case to say that the subject “I” is the condition of the predicate “think.” One thinks; but that this “one” is precisely the famous old “ego,” is, to put it mildly, only a supposition, an assertion, and assuredly not an “immediate certainty.” After all, one has even gone too far with this one thinks”—even the “one” contains an interpretation of the process, and does not belong to the process itself. One infers here according to the usual grammatical formula—”To think is an activity; every activity requires an agency that is active; consequently” . . . It was pretty much on the same lines that the older atomism sought, besides the operating “power,” the material particle wherein it resides and out of which it operates—the atom. More rigorous minds, however, learnt at last to get along without this “earth-residuum,” and perhaps some day we shall accustom ourselves, even from the logician’s point of view, to get along without the little “one” (to which the worthy old “ego” has refined itself).

18. It is certainly not the least charm of a theory that it is refutable; it is precisely thereby that it attracts the more subtle minds. It seems that the hundred-times-refuted theory of the “free will” owes its persistence to this charm alone; someone is always appearing who feels himself strong enough to refute it.

19. Philosophers are accustomed to speak of the will as though it were the best-known thing in the world; indeed, Schopenhauer has given us to understand that the will alone is really known to us, absolutely and completely known, without deduction or addition. But it again and again seems to me that in this case Schopenhauer also only did what philosophers are in the habit of doing—he seems to have adopted a popular prejudice and exaggerated it. Willing—seems to me to be above all something complicated, something that is a unity only in name—and it is precisely in a name that popular prejudice lurks, which has got the mastery over the inadequate precautions of philosophers in all ages. So let us for once be more cautious, let us be “unphilosophical”: let us say that in all willing there is firstly a plurality of sensations, namely, the sensation of the condition “away from which we go,” the sensation of the condition “towards which we go,” the sensation of this “from” and “towards” itself, and then besides, an accompanying muscular sensation, which, even without our putting in motion “arms and legs,” commences its action by force of habit, directly we “will” anything. Therefore, just as sensations (and indeed many kinds of sensations) are to be recognised as ingredients of the will, so, in the second place, thinking is also to be recognised; in every act of the will there is a ruling thought;—and let us not imagine it possible to sever this thought from the “willing,” as if the will would then remain over! In the third place, the will is not only a complex of sensation and thinking, but it is above all an emotion, and in fact the emotion of the command. That which is termed “freedom of the will” is essentially the emotion of supremacy in respect to him who must obey: “I am free, ‘he’ must obey”—this consciousness is inherent in every will; and equally so the straining of the attention, the straight look which fixes itself exclusively on one thing, the unconditional judgment that “this and nothing else is necessary now;” the inward certainty that obedience will be rendered—and whatever else pertains to the position of the commander. A man who wills commands something within himself which renders obedience, or which he believes renders obedience. But now let us notice what is the strangest thing about the will,—this affair so extremely complex, for which the people have only one name. Inasmuch as in the given circumstances we are at the same time the commanding and the obeying parties, and as the obeying party we know the sensations of constraint, impulse, pressure, resistance, and motion, which usually commence immediately after the act of will; inasmuch as, on the other hand, we are accustomed to disregard this duality, and to deceive ourselves about it by means of the synthetic term “I”: a whole series of erroneous conclusions, and consequently of false judgments about the will itself, has become attached to the act of willing—to such a degree that he who wills believes firmly that willing suffices for action. Since in the majority of cases there has only been exercise of will when the effect of the command—consequently obedience, and therefore action—was to be expected, the appearance has translated itself into the sentiment, as if there were there a necessity of effect; in a word, he who wills believes with a fair amount of certainty that will and action are somehow one; he ascribes the success, the carrying out of the willing, to the will itself, and thereby enjoys an increase of the sensation of power which accompanies all success. “Freedom of Will”—that is the expression for the complex state of delight of the person exercising volition, who commands and at the same time...
identifies himself with the executor of the order—who, as such, enjoys also the triumph over obstacles, but thinks within himself that it was really his own will that overcame them.

21. The causa sui is the best self-contradiction that has yet been conceived, it is a sort of logical violation and unnaturalness; but the extravagant pride of man has managed to entangle itself profoundly and frightfully with this very folly. The desire for “freedom of will” in the superlative, metaphysical sense, such as still holds sway, unfortunately, in the minds of the half-educated, the desire to bear the entire and ultimate responsibility for one’s actions oneself, and to absolve God, the world, ancestors, chance, and society therefrom, involves nothing less than to be precisely this causa sui, and, with more than Munchhausen daring, to pull oneself up into existence by the hair, out of the slough of nothingness. If any one should find out in this manner the crass stupidity of the celebrated conception of “free will” and put it out of his head altogether, I beg of him to carry his “enlightenment” a step further, and also put out of his head the contrary of this monstrous conception of “free will”: I mean “non-free will,” which is tantamount to a misuse of cause and effect. One should not wrongly materialise “cause” and “effect,” as the natural philosophers do (and whoever like them naturalise in thinking at present), according to the prevailing mechanical doltishness which makes the cause press and push until it “effects” its end; one should use “cause” and “effect” only as pure conceptions, that is to say, as conventional fictions for the purpose of designation and mutual understanding,—not for explanation. In “being-in-itself” there is nothing of “causal-connection,” of “necessity,” or of “psychological non-freedom”; there the effect does not follow the cause, there “law” does not obtain. It is we alone who have devised cause, sequence, reciprocity, relativity, constraint, number, law, freedom, motive, and purpose; and when we interpret and intermix this symbol-world, as “being in itself,” with things, we act once more as we have always acted—mythologically. The “non-free will” is mythology; in real life it is only a question of strong and weak wills.—It is almost always a symptom of what is lacking in himself, when a thinker, in every “causal-connection” and “psychological necessity,” manifests something of compulsion, indigence, obsequiousness, oppression, and non-freedom; it is suspicious to have such feelings—the person betrays himself. And in general, if I have observed correctly, the “non-freedom of the will” is regarded as a problem from two entirely opposite standpoints, but always in a profoundly personal manner: some will not give up their “responsibility,” their belief in themselves, the personal right to their merits, at any price (the vain races belong to this class); others on the contrary, do not wish to be answerable for anything, or blamed for anything, and owing to an inward self-contempt, seek to get out of the business, no matter how. The latter, when they write books, are in the habit at present of taking the side of criminals; a sort of socialistic sympathy is their favourite disguise. And as a matter of fact, the fatalism of the weak-willed embalishes itself surprisingly when it can pose as “la religion de la souffrance humaine”; that is its “good taste.”

22. Let me be pardoned, as an old philologist who cannot desist from the mischief of putting his finger on bad modes of interpretation, but “Nature’s conformity to law,” of which you physicists talk so proudly, as though—why, it exists only owing to your interpretation and bad “philology.” It is no matter of fact, no “text,” but rather just a naïvely humanitarian perversion of meaning, with which you make abundant concessions to the democratic instincts of the modern soul! “Everywhere equality before the law—Nature is not different in that respect, nor better than we”: a fine instance of secret motive, in which the vulgar antagonism to everything privileged and autocratic—likewise a second and more refined antheism—is once more distinguished. “Ni dieu, ni maître”—that, also, is what you want; and therefore “Cheers for natural law!”—is it not so? But, as has been said, that is interpretation, not text; and somebody might come along, who, with opposite intentions and modes of interpretation could read out of the same “Nature,” and with regard to the same phenomena, just the tyrannically inconceivable and relentless enforcement of the claims of power—an interpreter who should place the unexceptionalness and unconditionalness of all “Will to Power” before your eyes, that almost every word, and the word “tyranny” itself, would eventually seem unsuitable or like a weakening and softening metaphor—as being too human; and who should, nevertheless, end by asserting the same about this world as you do, namely, that it has a “necessary” and “calculable” course, not, however, because laws obtain in it, because they are absolutely lacking, and every power effects its ultimate consequences every moment. Granted that this also is only interpretation—and you will be eager enough to make this objection?—well, so much the better.

23. All psychology hitherto has run around on moral prejudices and timidities, it has not dared to launch out into the depths. In so far as it is allowable to recognise in that which has hitherto been written, evidence of that which has hitherto been kept silent, it seems as if nobody had yet harboured the notion of psychology as the Morephology and Development-doctrine of the Will to Power, as I conceive of it. The power of moral prejudices has penetrated deeply into the most intellectual world, the world apparently most indifferent and unprejudiced, and has obviously operated in an injurious, obstructive, blinding, and distorting manner. A proper physio-psychology has to contend with unconscious antagonism in the heart of the investigator, it has “the heart” against it: even a doctrine of the reciprocal conditionalness of the “good” and the “bad” impulses, causes (as refined immorality) distress and aversion in a still strong and manly conscience—still more so, a doctrine of the derivation of all good impulses from bad ones. If, however, a person should regard even the emotions of hatred, envy, covetousness, and imperiousness as life-conditioning emotions, as factors which must be present, fundamentally and essentially, in the general economy of life (which must, therefore, be further developed if life is to be further
developed), he will suffer from such a view of things as from sea-sickness. And yet this hypothesis is far from being the strangest and most painful in this immense and almost new domain of dangerous knowledge; and there are in fact a hundred good reasons why everyone should keep away from it who can do so! On the other hand, if one has once drifted hither with one’s bark, well! very good! now let us set our teeth firmly! let us open our eyes and keep our hand fast on the helm! We sail away right over morality, we crush out, we destroy perhaps the remains of our own morality by daring to make our voyage thither—but what do we matter! Never yet did a profounder world of insight reveal itself to daring travellers and adventurers, and the psychologist who thus “makes a sacrifice”—it is not the sacrifizio dell’intelletto, on the contrary!—will at least be entitled to demand in return that psychology shall once more be recognized as the queen of the sciences for whose service and equipment the other sciences exist. For psychology is once more the path to the fundamental problems.

Question:  
1. What does Nietzsche think is the basis of most philosophies?
24.6 Sir Edmund Gosse: from *Father and Son*

Sir Edmund Gosse (1849–1928) was a Cambridge professor and librarian of the House of Lords. He was instrumental in bringing Scandinavian literature to the attention of English-speaking readers. His memoir *Father and Son* described his relationship with his father, the English naturalists Philip Henry Gosse.


[The Dilemma of the Fundamentalist and Scientist]

So, through my Father’s brain, in that year of scientific crisis, 1857, there rushed two kinds of thought, each absorbing, each convincing, yet totally irreconcilable. There is a peculiar agony in the paradox that truth has two forms, each of them indisputable, yet each antagonistic to the other. It was this discovery, that there were two theories of physical life each of which was true, but the truth of each incompatible with the truth of the other, which shook the spirit of my Father with penturba. It was not, really, a paradox, if he could only have known it, but he allowed the turbid volume of superstition to drown the delicate stream of reason. He took one step in the service of truth, and then he drew back in an agony, and accepted the servitude of error.

This was the great moment in the history of thought when the theory of the mutability of species was preparing to throw a flood of light upon all departments of human speculation and action. It was becoming necessary to stand emphatically in one army or the other. Lyell was surrounding himself with disciples, who were making strides in the direction of discovery. Darwin had long been collecting facts with regard to the variation of animals and plants. Hooker and Wallace, Asa Gray and even Agassiz, each in his own sphere, were coming closer and closer to a perception of that secret which was first to reveal itself clearly to the patient and humble genius of Darwin. In the year before, in 1856, Darwin, under pressure from Lyell, had begun that modest statement of the new revelation, that “abstract of an essay,” which developed so mightily into *The Origin of Species*. Wollaston’s *Variation of Species* had just appeared, and had been a nine days’ wonder in the wilderness.

On the other side, the reactionaries, although never dreaming of the fate which hung over them, had not been idle. In 1857 the astounding question had for the first time been propounded with contumely, “What, then, did we come from orangoutang?” The famous *Vestiges of Creation* had been supplying a sugar-and-water panacea for those who could not escape from the trend of evidence, and who yet clung to revelation. Owen was encouraging reaction by resisting, with all the strength of his prestige, the theory of the mutability of species.

In this period of intellectual ferment, as when a great political revolution is being planned, many possible adherents were confidentially listed with hints and encouraged to reveal their bias in a whisper. It was the notion of Lyell, himself a great mover of men, that, before the doctrine of natural selection was given to a world which would be sure to lift up at it a howl of execration, a certain bodyguard of sound and experienced naturalists, expert in the description of species, should be privately made aware of its tenor. Among those who were thus initiated, or approached with a view towards possible illumination, was my Father. He was spoken to by Hooker, and later on by Darwin, after meetings of the Royal Society in the summer of 1857.

My Father’s attitude towards the theory of natural selection was critical in his career, and oddly enough, it exercised an immense influence on my own experience as a child. Let it be admitted at once, mournful as the admission is, that every instinct in his intelligence went out at first to greet the new light. It had hardly done so, when a recollection of the opening chapter of Genesis checked it at the outset. He consulted with Carpenter, a great investigator, but one who was fully as incapable as himself of remodeling his ideas with regard to the old, accepted hypotheses. They both determined, on various grounds, to have nothing to do with the terrible theory, but to hold steadily to the law of the fifty of species.

My Father had never admired Sir Charles Lyell. I think that the famous Lord Chancellor manner of the geologist intimidated him, and we undervalue the intelligence of those whose conversation puts us at a disadvantage. For Darwin and Hooker, on the other hand, he had a profound esteem, and I know not whether this had anything to do with the fact that he chose, for his impetuous experiment in reaction, the field of geology, rather than that of zoology or botany. Lyell had been threatening to publish a book on the geological history of Man, which was to be a bombshell flung into the camp of the catastrophists. My Father, after long reflection, prepared a theory of his own, which, as he fondly hoped, would take the wind out of Lyell’s sails, and justify geology to godly readers of Genesis. It was, very briefly, that there had been no gradual modification of the surface of the earth, or slow development of organic forms, but that when the catastrophic act of creation took place, the world presented, instantly, the structural appearance of a planet on which life had long existed.

The theory, coarsely enough, and to my Father’s great indignation, was defined by a hasty press as being this—that God hid the fossils in the rocks in order to tempt geologists into infidelity. In truth, it was this logical and inevitable
Conclusion of accepting, literally, the doctrine of a sudden act of creation; it emphasized the fact that any breach in the circular course of nature could be conceived only on the supposition that the object created bore false witness to past processes, which had never taken place.

Never was a book cast upon the waters with greater anticipations of success than was this curious, this obstinate, this fanatical volume. My Father lived in a fever of suspense, waiting for the tremendous issue. This Omphalos of his, he thought, was to bring all the turmoil of scientific speculation to a close, fling geology into the arms of Scriptures and make the lion eat grass with the lamb. It was not surprising, he admitted, that there had been experienced an ever-increasing discourse between the facts which geology brings to light and the direct statements of the early chapters of Genesis. Nobody was to blame for that. My Father, and my Father alone, possessed the secret of the enigma; he alone held the key which could smoothly open the lock of geological mystery. He offered it, with a glowing gesture, to atheists and Christians alike. This was to be the universal panacea; this the system of intellectual therapeutics which could not but heal all the maladies of the age. But alas! atheists and Christians alike looked at it, and laughed, and threw it away.

In the course of that dismal winter, as the post began to bring in private letters, few and chilly, and public reviews, many and scornful, my Father looked in vain for the approval of the churches, and in vain for the acquiescence of the scientific societies, and in vain for the gratitude of those “thousands of thinking persons,” which he had rashly assured himself of receiving. As his reconciliation of Scripture statements and geological deductions was welcomed nowhere; as Darwin continued silent and the youthful Huxley was scornful, and even Charles Kingsley,1 from whom my Father had expected the most instant appreciation, wrote that he could not “give up the painful and slow conclusion of five and twenty years’ study of geology, and believe that God has written on the rocks one enormous and superfluous lie”—as all this happened or failed to happen, a gloom, cold and dismal, descended upon our morning teacups.***

**Question:**
1. How does the dilemma of Gosse reflect the conflict between Christians and scientists? How is this manifested today?

---

1 Charles Kingsley (1819–1875), clergyman and novelist.
PART 25
Nationalism and Imperialism

25.1 Confessions of Faith, Cecil Rhodes

One of the byproducts of extreme nationalism was the desire to establish profitable colonies in areas of the world that were less established industrially, and thus, less likely to provide any social or cultural opposition. Europeans created various theories and rationalizations in the later nineteenth century to justify imperialism. These justifications were manufactured out of religious conviction. Social Darwinism, racism, and nationalism. Cecil Rhodes, Britain’s strongest promoter of empire, outlined his views on British imperialism in this personal “confession” written in the 1870s.


It often strikes a man to inquire what is the chief good in life; to one the thought comes that it is a happy marriage, to another great wealth, and as each seizes on his idea, for that he more or less works for the rest of his existence. To myself thinking over the same question the wish came to render myself useful to my country. I then asked myself how could I and after reviewing the various methods I have felt that at the present day we are actually limiting our children and perhaps bringing into the world half the human beings we might owing to the lack of country for them to inhabit that if we had retained America there would at this moment be millions more of English living. I contend that we are the finest race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race. Just fancy those parts that are at present inhabited by the most despicable specimens of human beings what an alteration there would be if they were brought under Anglo-Saxon influence, look again at the extra employment a new country added to our dominions gives. I contend that every acre added to our territory means in the future birth to some more of the English race who otherwise would not be brought into existence. Added to this the absorption of the greater portion of the world under our rule simply means the end of all wars, at this moment had we not lost America I believe we could have stopped the Russian-Turkish war by merely refusing money and supplies. Having these ideas what scheme could we think of to forward this object. I look into history and I read the story of the Jesuits I see what they were able to do in a bad cause and I might say under bad leaders.

In the present day I become a member in the Masonic order I see the wealth and power they possess the influence they hold and I think over their ceremonies and I wonder that a large body of men can devote themselves to what at times appear the most ridiculous and absurd rites without an object and without an end.

The idea gleaming and dancing before ones eyes like a will-of-the-wisp at last frames itself into a plan. Why should we not form a secret society with but one object the furtherance of the British Empire and the bringing of the whole uncivilised world under British rule for the recovery of the United States for the making the Anglo-Saxon race but one Empire. What a dream, but yet it is probable, it is possible. I once heard it argued by a fellow in my own college, I am sorry to own it by an Englishman, that it was a good thing for us that we have lost the United States. There are some subjects on which there can be no arguments, and to an Englishman this is one of them, but even from an American’s point of view just picture what they have lost, look at their government, are not the frauds that yearly come before the public view a disgrace to any country and especially theirs which is the finest in the world. Would they have occurred had they remained under English rule great as they have become how infinitely greater they would have been with the softening and elevating influences of English rule, think of those countless 000’s of Englishmen that during the last 100 years would have crossed the Atlantic and settled and populated the United States. Would they have not made without any prejudice a finer country of it than the low class Irish and German emigrants? All this we have lost and that country loses owing to whom? Owing to two or three ignorant pig-headed statesmen of the last century, at their door lies the blame. Do you ever feel mad? do you ever feel murderous? I think I do with those men. I bring facts to prove my assertion. Does an English father when his sons wish to emigrate ever think of suggesting emigration to a country under another flag, never—it would seem a disgrace to suggest such a thing I think that we all think that poverty is better under our own flag than wealth under a foreign one.

Put your mind into another train of thought. Fancy Australia discovered and colonised under the French flag, what would it mean merely several millions of English unborn that at present exist we learn from the past and to form our future. We learn from having lost to cling to what we possess. We know the size of the world we know the total extent. Africa is still lying ready for us it is our duty to take it. It is our duty to seize every opportunity of acquiring more territory and we should keep this one idea steadily before our eyes that more territory simply means more of the Anglo-Saxon race more of the best the most human, most honourable race the world possesses.
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To forward such a scheme what a splendid help a secret society would be a society not openly acknowledged but who would work in secret for such an object.

I contend that there are at the present moment numbers of the ablest men in the world who would devote their whole lives to it. I often think what a loss to the English nation in some respects the abolition of the Rotten Borough System has been. What thought strikes a man entering the house of commons, the assembly that rules the whole world? I think it is the mediocrity of the men but what is the cause. It is simply—an assembly of wealth of men whose lives have been spent in the accumulation of money and whose time has been too much engaged to be able to spare any for the study of past history. And yet in the hands of such men rest our destinies. Do men like the great Pitt, and Burke and Sheridan not now exist. I contend they do.... They live and die unused unemployed. What has been the main cause of the success of the Romish Church? The fact that every enthusiast, call it if you like every madman finds employment in it. Let us form the same kind of society—a Church for the extension of the British Empire. A society which should have its members in every part of the British Empire working with one object and one idea we should have its members placed at our universities and our schools and should watch the English youth passing through their hands just one perhaps in every thousand would have the mind and feelings for such an object, he should be tried in every way, he should be tested whether he is endurant, possessed of eloquence, disregardful of the petty details of life, and if found to be such, then elected and bound by oath to serve for the rest of his life in his Country. He should then be supported if without means by the Society and sent to that part of the Empire where it was felt he was needed.

Take another case,... of the younger son with high thoughts, high aspirations, endowed by nature with all the faculties to make a great man, and with the sole wish in life to serve his Country but he lacks two things the means and the opportunity, ever troubled by a sort of inward deity urging him on to high and noble deeds, he is compelled to pass his time in some occupation which furnishes him with mere existence, he lives unhappily and dies miserably. Such men as these the Society should search out and use for the furtherance of their object.

(In every Colonial legislature the Society should attempt to have its members prepared at all times to vote or speak and advocate the closer union of England and the colonies, to crush all disloyalty and every movement for the severance of our Empire. The Society should inspire and even own portions of the press for the press rules the mind of the people. The Society should always be searching for members who might by their position in the world by their energies or character forward the object but the ballot and test for admittance should be severe.)

Once make [the society] common and it fails. Take a man of great wealth who is bereft of his children perhaps having his mind soured by some bitter disappointment who shuts himself up separate from his neighbours and makes up his mind to a miserable existence. To such men as these the society should go gradually disclose the greatness of their scheme and entreat him to throw in his life and property with them for this object. I think that there are thousands now existing who would eagerly grasp at the opportunity. Such are the heads of my scheme.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 25.1 and 25.2.

1. What arguments do both Cecil Rhodes and Carl Peters advance for national imperialism and colonization? How do their arguments differ?
2. What means do they each propose to achieve their ends? How do their plans differ?
3. What prejudices of the authors do these two documents reveal?
25.2 Manifesto for the Society for German Colonization

German nationalism first directed energy into unification, so it was a tardy contender in the competition for colonies at the end of the nineteenth century. All the territories most profitable, suitable for settlement, or strategically important had already been claimed by rival European states. Nevertheless, Carl Peters (1856–1918), the founder of German East Africa (Tanzania), believed it was necessary for Germany to acquire a colonial empire.


**APRIL 1884**

In the partition of the earth, as it has proceeded from the beginning of the fifteenth century up to our times, the German nation received nothing. All the remaining European culture-bearing peoples possess areas outside our continent where their languages and customs can take firm root and flourish. The moment that the German emigrant leaves the borders of the Reich behind him, he is a stranger sojourning on foreign soil. The German Reich, great in size and strength through its bloodily achieved unity, stands in the leading position among the continental European powers: her sons abroad must adapt themselves to nations which look upon us with either indifference or even hostility. For centuries the great stream of German emigration has been plunging down into foreign races where it is lost sight of. Germandom outside Europe has been undergoing a perpetual national decline.

This fact, so painful to national pride, also represents a great economic disadvantage for our Volk. Every year our Fatherland loses the capacity of approximately 200,000 Germans. The greatest amount of this capacity flows directly into the camp of our economic competitors and increases the strength of our rivals. Germany’s imports of products from tropical zones originate in foreign settlements whereby many millions of German capital are lost every year to alien nations. German exports are dependent upon the discretion of foreign tariff policies. Our industry lacks an absolutely safe market for its goods because our Volk lacks colonies of its own.

The alleviation of this national grievance requires taking practical steps and strong action.

In recognition of this point of view, a society has been organized in Berlin with the goal of mobilizing itself for such steps and such action. The Society for German Colonization aims to undertake on its own, in a resolute and sweeping manner, carefully chosen colonization projects and thereby supplement the ranks of organizations with similar tendencies.

Its particular tasks will be:

1. to provide necessary sums of capital for colonization;
2. to seek out and lay claim to suitable districts for colonization;
3. to direct German emigrants to these regions.

Imbued as we are with the conviction that it is no longer permissible to hesitate in energetically mobilizing ourselves for this great national task, we venture to come before the German Volk with a plea for active support of the endeavors of our Society! The German nation has proven time and again its willingness to make sacrifices for general patriotic undertakings: may she also bring her full energies to play in the solution of this great historical task.

Every German whose heart beats for the greatness and the honor of our nation is entreated to come to the side of our Society. What is at stake is compensation for centuries of deprivation: to prove to the world that, along with the splendor of the Reich, the German Volk has inherited the old German national spirit of its forefathers!

**Questions:**
The following questions pertain to documents 25.1 and 25.2.

1. What arguments do both Cecil Rhodes and Carl Peters advance for national imperialism and colonization? How do their arguments differ?
2. What means do they each propose to achieve their ends? How do their plans differ?
3. What prejudices of the authors do these two documents reveal?
25.3 A White Woman's Perspective of Africa

Influenced by her father and brother, both who traveled extensively outside Europe, and her uncle, a well-known scientist, Mary Kingsley (1862–1900) traveled to West Africa in the 1890s after the death of her parents left her a small inheritance. Returning to England, she lectured and published on West African customs, which she was able to learn by becoming a trader. She also brought back several fish species new to European science, one of which is named after her. Later, while serving as a nurse in the South Africa Boer War, she died of enteric fever.


Then in addition to the store work, a fruitful source of work and worry are the schools, for both boys and girls. It is regarded as futile to attempt to get any real hold over the children unless they are removed from the influence of the country fashions that surround them in their village homes; therefore the schools are boarding; hence the entire care of the children, including feeding and clothing, falls on the missionary.

The French government has made things harder by decreeing that the children should be taught French. It does not require that evangelistic work should be carried on in French, but that if foreign languages are taught, that language shall be French first. The general feeling of the missionaries is against this, because of the great difficulty in teaching the native this delicate and highly complex language. English, the Africans pick up sooner than any foreign language. I do not like to think that my esteemed friend Donna Maria de Sousa Coutinho is right in saying “because it is so much more like their own savage tongue,” but regard this facility in acquiring it to the universal use of it in the form of trade English in the villages round them. Indeed, I believe that if the missionary was left alone he would not teach any European language, but confine himself to using the native languages in his phonetically written-down form; because the Africans learn to read this very quickly, and the missionary can confine their reading to those books he thinks suitable for perusal by his flock—namely, the Bible, hymn-book, and Bunyan’s Holy War.

The native does not see things in this light, and half the time comes to the schools only to learn, what he calls “sense” i.e., white man’s ways and language, which will enable him to trade with greater advantage. Still, I think the French government is right, from what I have seen in our own possessions of the disadvantage, expense, and inconvenience of the bulk of the governed not knowing the language of their governors, both parties having therefore frequently to depend on native interpreters: and native interpreters are “deceitful above all things and desperately wicked” occasionally, and the just administration of the country under these conditions is almost impossible....

But to return to the Mission Évangélique schools. This mission does not undertake technical instruction. All the training the boys get is religious and scholastic. The girls fare somewhat better, for they get in addition instruction from the mission ladies in sewing, washing, and ironing, and for the rest of it they have an uncommonly pleasant and easy time which they most bitterly regret as past when they go to their husbands, for husbands they each of them have.

The teaching even of sewing, washing, and ironing is a little previous. Good Mme. Jacot will weary herself for months to teach a Fan girl how to make herself a dress, and the girl will learn eagerly, and so keenly enjoy the dress when it is made that it breaks one’s heart when one knows that this same girl, when her husband takes her to his village soon, in spite of the two dresses the mission gave her, will be reduced to a bit of filthy rag, which will serve her for dress, sheet, towel and dish cloth: for even were her husband willing to get her more cloth to exercise her dressmaking accomplishments on, he dare not. Men are men, and women are women all the world over; and what would his other wives, and his mother and sisters say? Then the washing and ironing are quite parlour accomplishments when your husband does not wear a shirt, and household linen is non-existent as is the case among the Fans and many other African tribes. There are other things that the women might be taught with greater advantage to them and those round them.

It is strange that all the cooks employed by the Europeans should be men, yet all the cooking among the natives themselves is done by women, and done abominably badly in all the Bantu tribes I have ever come across; and the Bantu are in this particular, and indeed in most particulars, far inferior to the true Negro; though I must say this is not the orthodox view. The Negroes cook uniformly very well, and at moments are inspired in the direction of palm-oil chop and fish cooking. Not so the Bantu, whose methods cry aloud for improvement, they having just the very easiest and laziest way possible of dealing with food.
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Now polygamy is, like most other subjects, a difficult thing to form an opinion on, if, before forming that opinion, you go and make a study of the facts and bearings of the case. It is therefore advisable to follow the usual method employed by the majority of people. Just take a prejudice of your own, and fix it up with the so-called opinions of people who go in for that sort of prejudice too. This method is absolutely essential to the forming of an opinion on the subject of polygamy among African tribes, that will be acceptable in enlightened circles. Polygamy is the institution which above all others governs the daily life of the native; and it is therefore the one which the missionaries who enter into this daily life, and not merely into the mercantile and legal, as do the trader and the government official, are constantly confronted with and hindered by. All the missionaries have set their faces against it and deny Church membership to those men who practise it; whereby it falls out that many men are excluded from the fold who would make quite as good Christians as those within it.

briefly I will say that I consider the African fails in enthusiasm, in power of combination, and in that restless desire for wealth and conquest, not conquest over the next-door tribe only, but conquest over the very powers of Nature themselves that characterise our race. He looks at things white men do, not with that awe usually credited to him; he thinks our things are queer, possibly dangerous, not necessarily desirable in every case, he soon gets used to them, and learns how to manage them, but he does not bother his head to make himself some like them; his imitation of white men’s way is founded on a feeling that white men are big men, and he would like to be a big man too in a way, but it is a feeling more akin to vanity than akin to emulation; that it has not been a sound ground to build on has been amply shown by the effects of the treatment of Africans by the white man, a subject I will next briefly mention by saying I think we may safely assume both sides have been to blame. There are two things that the white is most virulently abused for by moralists, the slave trade and the liquor traffic, while the most common forms of criticism on the black is that he is an indolent brute, a fiendish savage or a child—irresponsible, ungrateful, lying, thievish, and so on, are thrown in on top as remarks by the way on his character.

If the African were a flighty-minded fiend, a lazy brute, or a child, the methods now in force, and that have been in force all these years, would have succeeded. In spite of all the noble and devoted lives laid down, in spite of all the blood and money, they have not. That he is not a fiend the African has shown by his treatment of Livingstone, Thompson, Barth, and a hundred others, least amongst whom am I; that he is not a child he has shown clearly to those who have traded with him, and by the individual Africans who have risen to a higher culture level under European and Asiatic education. I am aware that the educated African is said to invariably go fanette, as it is called up here, and this picturesque and thrilling conduct of the educated African is supported by a few instances. But I need hardly assure you it is not the invariable custom; and there have been in the past and there are now living dozens of Europeanised Africans in West Africa, ministers, lawyers, and doctors, who would no more want to take off their store clothing and go cannibalising and howling about the bush than you would. Nevertheless, the African who turns into a Europeanised man is the exception that proves the rule, and whose isolated conduct misleads the white man, inducing him to go on on this old line, dazzled by the performance of one in a hundred thousand; we seem blind to the inertia of the great mass, that great mass that we have to deal with today in a state practically unaltered by the white work of four hundred years’ duration.

Now I have said I would give a suggestion for the solution of this problem, and I humbly give it—it is, understand the nature of the African. If any of you want to make a great piece of machinery, or build a bridge, or a house, you succeed in your endeavour primarily from a knowledge of the nature of the materials you employ, and so you may succeed in dealing with the African if you will clear your mind of all prejudice and study what is the nature of man. Take him at his lowest. To my mind he is the most magnificent mass of labour material in the world, and he is, taken as a whole, one of the most generous, kindly, good-tempered races of men on earth: intellectually he is at any rate shrewd, and, strange to say, possessed of an immense wealth of practical common sense. Surely that is good stuff to go on, surely something ought to be done with it more economically and more humanely than is being done;

The nature of the African thought-form in the region, therefore, between the Niger and the Congo, is the thing I have devoted my time to, recognising that with him his religion—his conception of the status of Man in Nature, is the ruling thing of his life and action; for whether he be altered by outside influence or no, the African can never say, “Oh, one must be practical, you know! That’s all right from a religious point of view, but one must be practical.” To be practical, to get on in this world, the African must be right from his religious point of view all the time, therefore to understand him you must understand that religious point of view to its very root, and go and study it in an unadulterated form.
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The thing is worth taking up alike for humane as well as scientific reasons; though it is difficult, one has no right to dwell on its danger. No one need go out to West Africa without knowing the chances are they go out there to stay, and even if they should go out in ignorance, on landing they will be enlightened, and can take the next boat home. I remember on my first landing at a place where there are three small factories only, but which I had seen marked large on a map, asking a resident white if this was all the settlement. “Oh no,” said he, “this is only the porter’s lodge, I’ll show you the settlement,” and he took me to the cemetery; that cemetery justified the large lettering on the map. But settlements, even with the best of cemetery accommodation, are not the ethnologist’s place: he must go right away into the fastnesses of the forest, sit and gossip at village fires, become the confidential friend of witch doctors and old ladies, and he must go alone without an armed expedition which will wall him off from the residential African. This sort of life he can comparatively easily lead, if he will learn the trade details of the locality sufficiently to enable him to pass as a trader; in the wildest districts he is reasonable to the African mind if he appears in this guise, and he is safer than he has any right to expect to be under the circumstances, and the amount of information he can pick up is immense, only, alas! that information is not arranged in a manner suitable for use in schools. Nevertheless, it is worth having. In past days, when Africa was left to the Europeans out there and the natives, the collection of ethnological information had merely a scientific and philosophic interest; now it has a greater one, for now European governments are undertaking to legislate domestically for the African from European offices. They cannot do this thing successfully unless they have in their possession a full knowledge of the nature of the people they are legislating for; without this, let their intentions be of the best, they will waste a grievous mass of blood and money, and fail in the end.

Questions:
1. How does Kingsley describe the west Africans?
2. What does she think of the efforts of the missionaries and the imperialists in west Africa?
3. In what ways does Kingsley question European imperialist views?
4. In what ways does she share the imperialist views?
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25.4 Black Man’s Burden

While the vast majority of people in the imperial powers accepted Kipling’s ideas, other perspectives did exist. E.D. Morel responded to the notion of the “white man’s burden,” with “The Black Man’s Burden,” written in 1920. In 1906, he wrote an expose against Belgian labor practices in the Congo, one of the most notorious for bad treatment of the colonized.


It is with the peoples of Africa, then, that our inquiry is concerned. It is they who carry the “Black man’s” burden. They have not withered away before the white man’s occupation. Indeed, if the scope of this volume permitted, there would be no difficulty in showing that Africa has ultimately absorbed within itself every Caucasian and, for that matter, every Semitic invader too. In hewing out for himself a fixed abode in Africa, the white man has massacred the African in heaps. The African has survived, and it is well for the white settlers that he has.

In the process of imposing his political dominion over the African, the white man has carved broad and bloody avenues from one end of Africa to the other. The African has resisted, and persisted.

For three centuries the white man seized and enslaved millions of Africans and transported them, with every circumstance of ferocious cruelty, across the seas. Still the African survived and, in his land of exile, multiplied exceedingly.

But what the partial occupation of his soil by the white man has failed to do; what the mapping out of European political “spheres of influence” has failed to do; what the maxim and the rifle, the slave gang, labour in the bowels of the earth and the lash, have failed to do; what imported measles, smallpox and syphilis have failed to do; what even the overseas slave trade failed to do, the power of modern capitalistic exploitation, assisted by modern engines of destruction, may yet succeed in accomplishing.

For from the veils of the latter, scientifically applied and enforced, there is no escape for the African. Its destructive effects are not spasmodic: they are permanent. In its permanence resides its fatal consequences. It kills not the body merely but the soul. It breaks the spirit. It attacks the African at every turn, from every point of vantage. It wrecks his polity, uproots him from the land, invades his family life, destroys his natural pursuits and occupations, claims his whole time, enslaves him in his own home.

Economic bondage and wage slavery, the grinding pressure of a life of toil, the incessant demands of industrial capitalism—these things a landless European proletariat physically endures, though hardly.... The recuperative forces of a temperate climate are there to arrest the ravages, which alleviating influences in the shape of prophylactic and curative remedies will still further circumscribe. But in Africa, especially in tropical Africa, which a capitalistic imperialism threatens and has, in part, already devastated, man is incapable of reacting against unnatural conditions. In those regions man is engaged in a perpetual struggle against disease and an exhausting climate, which tells heavily upon child-bearing; and there is no scientific machinery for saving the weaker members of the community. The African of the tropics is capable of tremendous physical labours. But he cannot accommodate himself to the European system of monotonous, uninterrupted labour, with its long and regular hours, involving, moreover, as it frequently does, severance from natural surroundings and nostalgia, the condition of melancholy resulting from separation from home, a malady to which the African is specially prone. Climatic conditions forbid it. When the system is forced upon him, the tropical African droops and dies....

Thus the African is really helpless against the material gods of the white man, as embodied in the trinity of imperialism, capitalistic-exploitation, and militarism. If the white man retains these gods and if he insists upon making the African worship them as assiduously as he has done himself, the African will go the way of the Red Indian, the Amerindian, the Carib, the Guanche, the aboriginal Australian, and many more. And this would be at once a crime of enormous magnitude, and a world disaster.

Question:
1. Why does Morel envision industrialization to be so much worse than previous trials imposed by the whites?
25.5 Between Ruler and Ruled

Raden Ajeng Kartini (Raden Ajeng is a title) (1879–1904), a member of the Javanese aristocracy, lived under Dutch rule. With her father as regent of Japara, she and her siblings grew up learning both Javanese Muslim traditions and European ideas. In 1903, she entered an arranged marriage with the regent of Rembang. She began a vocational school for Javanese girls, with the support of the Dutch civil servant Dr. J.H. Abendanon, Minister of Education and Industry for the Netherlands India. She also corresponded with his wife Mevrouw (Stella).


I shall relate to you the history of a gifted and educated Javanese. The boy had passed his examinations, and was number one in one of three principal high schools of Java. Both at Semarang, where he went to school, and at Batavia, where he stood his examinations, time doors of the best houses were open to the amiable school-boy, with his agreeable and cultivated manners and great modesty.

Every one spoke Dutch to him, and he could express himself in that language with distinction. Fresh from this environment, he went back to the house of his parents. He thought it would be proper to pay his respects to the authorities of the place and he found himself in the presence of the Resident who had heard of him, and here it was that my friend made a mistake. He dared to address the great man in Dutch.

The following morning notice of an appointment as clerk to a comptroller in the mountains was sent to him. There the young man must remain to think over his "misdeeds" and forget all that he had learned at the schools. After some years a new comptroller or possibly assistant comptroller came; then the measure of his misfortunes was made to overflow. The new chief was a former school-fellow, one who had never shone through his abilities. The young man who had led his classes in everything must now creep upon the ground before the one-time dunce, and speak always high Javanese to him, while he himself was answered in bad Malay. Can you understand the misery of a proud and independent spirit so humbled? And how much strength of character it must have taken to endure that petty and annoying oppression?

But at last he could stand it no longer, he betook himself to Batavia and asked his excellency the Governor General for an audience; it was granted him. The result was that he was sent to Preanger, with a commission to make a study of the rice culture there. He made himself of service through the translation of a pamphlet on the cultivation of water crops from Dutch into Javanese and Sudanese. The government presented him in acknowledgement with several hundred gilders. In the comptroller’s school at Batavia, a teacher’s place was vacant—a teacher of the Javanese language be it understood—and his friends (among the Javanese) did all in their power to secure this position for him, but without result.

It was an absurd idea for a Native to have European pupils who later might become ruling government officials. Perish the thought! I should like to ask who could teach Javanese better than a born Javanese?

The young man went back to his dwelling place; in the meantime another Resident had come, and the talented son of the brown race might at last become an assistant wedono.* Not for nothing had he been banished for years to that distant place. He had learned wisdom there; namely, that one cannot serve a European official better than by creeping in the dust before him, and by never speaking a single word of Dutch in his presence. Others have now come into power, and lately when the position of translator of the Javanese language became vacant it was offered to our friend (truly opportunely) now that he does not stand in any one’s way!

Stella, I know an Assistant Resident, who speaks Malay with a Regent, although he knows that the latter speaks good Dutch. Every one else converses confidentially with this native ruler but the Assistant Resident—never.

My brothers speak in high Javanese to their superiors, who answer them in Dutch or in Malay. Those who speak Dutch to them are our personal friends; several of whom have asked my brothers to speak to them in the Dutch language, but they prefer not to do it, and Father also never does. The boys and Father know all too well why they must hold to the general usage.

There is too much idle talk about the word “prestige,” through the imaginary dignity of the under officials. I do not bother about prestige. I am only amused at the manner in which they preserve their prestige over us Javanese.

Sometimes I cannot suppress a smile. It is distinctly diverting to see the great men try to inspire us with awe. I had to bite my lips to keep from laughing outright when I was on a journey not long ago, and saw an Assistant Resident go from his office to his house under the shade of a gold umbrella, which a servant held spread above his noble head. It was such a ridiculous spectacle! Heavens! If he only knew how the humble crowds who respectfully retreated to one side before the glittering sunshade, immediately his back was turned, burst out laughing.
Part 25: Nationalism and Imperialism

There are many, yes very many Government officials, who allow the native rulers to kiss their feet, and their knees. Kissing the foot is the highest token of respect that we Javanese can show to our parents, or elderly blood relatives, and to our own rulers. We do not find it pleasant to do this for strangers; no, the European makes himself ridiculous in our eyes whenever he demands from us those tokens of respect which our own rulers alone have the right.

It is a matter of indifference when Residents and Assistant Residents allow themselves to be called “Kandjeng,” but when overseers, railroad engineers (and perhaps tomorrow, station-masters too) allow themselves to be thus addressed by their servants, it is absurdly funny. Do these people really know what Kandjeng means?

It is a title that the natives give to their hereditary rulers. I used to think that it was only natural for the stupid Javanese to love all this flim-flam, but now I see that the civilized, enlightened Westerner is not averse to it, that he is daft about it.

I never allow women older than I to show all the prescribed ceremonies to me, even though I know they would gladly, for though I am so young, I am a scion of what they consider an ancient, noble and honoured house; for which in the past, they have poured out both blood and gold in large measure. It is strange how attached inferiors are to those above them. But to me, it goes against the grain when people older than I creep in the dust before me.

With heavy hearts, many Europeans here see how the Javanese, whom, they regard as their inferiors, are slowly awakening, but at every turn a brown man comes up, who shows that he has just as good brains in his head, and just as good heart in his body, as the white man.

But we are going forward, and they cannot hold back the current of time. I love the Hollanders very, very much, and I am grateful for everything that we have gained through them. Many of them are among our best friends, but there are also others who dislike us, for no other reason than we are bold enough to emulate them in education and culture.

In many subtle ways they make us feel their dislike. “I am a European, you are a Javanese,” they seem to say, or “I am the master, you the governed.” Not once, but many times, they speak to us in broken Malay; although they know very well that we understand the Dutch language. It would be a matter of indifference to me in what language they addressed us, if the tone were only polite. Not long ago, a Raden Ajoie was talking to a gentleman, and impulsively she said, “Sir, excuse me, but may I make a friendly request, please, speak to me in your own language. I understand and speak Malay very well, but alas, only high Malay. I do not understand this passer-Malay.” How our gentleman hung his head!

Why do many Hollanders find it unpleasant to converse with us in their own language? Oh yes, now I understand; Dutch is too beautiful to be spoken by a brown mouth.

A few days ago we paid a visit to Totokkers (Europeans who are new-comers in Java). Their domestics were old servants of ours, and we knew that they could speak and understand Dutch very well. I told the host this, and what answer did I receive from my gentleman? “No, they must not speak Dutch.” “No, why?” I asked. “Because natives ought not to know Dutch.” I looked at him in amazement, and a satirical smile quivered at the corners of my mouth. The gentleman grew fiery red, mumbled something into his beard, and discovered something interesting in his boots, at least he devoted all of his attention to them.

Questions:
1. How and why was language so important to both the colonizer and the colonized?
2. What role did language play in the power relations between the colonized and the colonizer?
3. What do you learn about Dutch colonial rule and their attitudes towards the Javanese from this letter?

* Administrative official
25.6 Advocating Change

Responding to China’s increasing difficulties, Chang, among others, searched for ways to improve and strengthen China. Chang had a long record of encouraging education, building schools and sending students abroad to Japan and Europe to learn. He also worked to modernize China’s military and manufacturing. In 1898, he published his “Exhortation to Study,” excerpted below. It was well received by the Chinese imperial government and copies were distributed to officials throughout China.


RECTIFICATION OF POLITICAL RIGHTS

Nowadays scholars who hate the customs of the times are angry at the foreigners for cheating and encroaching upon us, at the generals for being unable to fight, at the great officials for not carrying out reforms, at the directors of education for not developing schools, and at numerous officials for not investigating industry and commerce. Therefore they promote discussion of the people’s rights [min-ch’üan, the term used above by Wang K’ang-nien and later used by Sun Yat-sen: “democracy”] in order to get the people to unite and exert themselves. Alas, why use such words that incite disorder!

The doctrine of people’s rights will bring us not a single benefit but a hundred evils. Are we going to establish a parliament? Among the Chinese scholars and people there are still many even today who are content to be vulgar and rustic. They are ignorant of the general situation of the world, they do not understand the basic system of the state. They have not the most rudimentary ideas about foreign countries—about the schools, the political systems, military training, and manufacture of armaments. Even supposing the confused and clamorous people are assembled in one house, for every one of them who is clear-sighted, there will be a hundred others whose vision is beclouded; they will converse at random and talk as if in a dream—what use will it be?

Moreover in foreign countries, in such affairs as raising funds [levying taxes] and other financial matters, the emphasis is on the lower house; in other (important) legislation the emphasis is on the upper house. In general one must have moderate wealth in his family to get to be a member of parliament. Nowadays Chinese merchants rarely have much capital; the Chinese people, moreover, are lacking in farsighted long range ambitions. When an important proposal for raising funds is to be discussed, all of them make excuses and keep silent. So their discussion is tantamount to non-discussion. This is the first reason why there is no use (in having a parliament). [The author goes on to state three more reasons, which we omit.]

[P. 24] Nowadays China is indeed neither impressive nor powerful. Nevertheless, the populace are still content with their daily work because the laws of the dynasty hold them together. Once the doctrine of people’s rights is advocated, foolish people will assuredly be delighted; unruly people will rise up; the laws will not be carried out; great disorder will arise on all sides...

Furthermore, the towns will certainly be plundered and churches burned or destroyed. I am afraid that certain foreign countries will be sure to take the protection of their nationals and properties as a pretext and send their gunboats with land forces to penetrate deeply and occupy our territories. The whole country then will belong to others with our acquiescence. Thus the doctrine of people’s rights is just what our enemies will like to hear about...

Formerly in France, after a succession of harsh regimes under tyrannical rulers, the people of the whole country were resentful and furious, the higher and lower orders attacked each other, and then she was changed into a republic [min-chu chih kuo, lit., a state where the people are the masters]. Our dynasty has been profoundly magnanimous and generously benevolent; and there has been no harsh government. Why bother to urge these steps (which can only result in) disorder and bring woe both to oneself and to the empire as well?...
An investigation of the origin of the doctrine of people’s rights in foreign countries merely reveals the idea that a state should have a parliament where the people can express their general opinion and communicate their group feelings. It is only desired that the people should be able to explain their feelings; it is not desired that they wield any power. Translators have altered the wording to call it “people’s rights,” which is a mistake. (Note: Americans who have come to China have themselves spoken of the defects of their public elections. The people below usually cherish selfish plans and those above play favorites, which has caused great trouble. Those Chinese who praise it are all talking without thorough investigation.)

In recent days those who have picked up some Western doctrines have even gone so far as to say that everybody has the right to be his own master [tzu-chu]; this is even more absurd. This phrase is derived from their religious book. It means that a man is endowed by God with his nature and soul, that every person has wisdom and intelligence, and that all are capable of doing useful work. The translators eventually interpret it to mean that every person has the right to be his own master. This interpretation is a still worse blunder... [P. 25] Each Western state definitely has a government, and a government has laws. Officials have administrative laws, soldiers have military laws, workers have labor laws, and merchants have commercial laws. The lawyers learn them, and judges preserve them. Neither the ruler nor the people can violate the law. What is suggested by the executive may be argued by members of parliament, and what is decided by the parliament may be dissolved by the ruling dynasty. To say that nobody has the right to be his own master is correct, but how can we say that every person is his own master?

In general the uproar of a market must certainly cease in the end; and in a group of bandits there must be a chief. If people are all their own masters, every family will be selfish for itself, every village will be selfish for itself, every scholar will want to sit and eat, every farmer will want exemption from his tax, every merchant will want a monopoly, every worker will want a higher wage, poor people without an occupation will want to rob or plunder, the son will not obey his father, the pupil will not respect his teacher, the wife will not obey her husband, the lowly will not submit to the exalted, and the weak will be the prey of the strong. There will be no end until mankind is entirely extinct. Certainly there has been no such government among the myriad nations of the earth, nor any such custom among aboriginal and barbarous tribes.

In foreign countries today there are liberal [tzu-yu, “freedom”] parties—the western word actually sounds li-po-erh-t’e [liberty]—which means that everything must be just and of benefit to the multitude. The name may be translated “public opinion party,” but to translate it “freedom” [tzu-yu] is wrong.

As for the policy of strengthening China to resist foreign countries, the only way is to use the principles of loyalty and righteousness in order to summon and unite the moral vigor [hsin] of the empire, and to exert the majestic spiritual power of the court toward uniting the strength of the entire country. These are fundamental principles of the universe, which do not change either in ancient or in modern times, either in China or in foreign countries.

**FOLLOWING THE PROPER ORDER**

Now if we wish to make China strong and to preserve Chinese knowledge, we must study Western knowledge. Nevertheless, if we do not use Chinese knowledge to consolidate the foundation first and get straight in our own minds what our interests and purposes are, then the strong will become rebellious leaders and the weak will become slaves of others [i.e., of the foreigners]...

Scholars today must master the classics first, in order to understand the purpose underlying the establishment of education by our ancient Chinese sages and teachers. They must study history, in order to learn the rise and fall of succeeding dynasties of China, and the customs of the empire. They must glance over the philosophical works and belles-lettres in order to become thoroughly familiar with Chinese academic ideas and exquisite writings. And then they can select and make use of that Western knowledge which can make up our shortcomings, and adopt those Western methods of government which can cure our illnesses. These, then, will be beneficial and harmless. As one who is recuperating must first get some energy from rice, and then be offered all sorts of delicacies... [p. 28] so the acquisition of Western knowledge must follow after Chinese knowledge.
In all schools in foreign countries the Bible of Jesus Christ must be read every day to illustrate their religion. In grade schools Latin must be learned first to ensure the preservation of antiquity. The map of their own country must be familiar first, before the map of the whole globe is examined, to show that there is a proper order... A Chinese scholar not versed in Chinese knowledge resembles a man who does not know his own surname, or a riding horse without a bridle, or a boat without a rudder; the more profound his Western knowledge the more severe will be his contempt for China. Even though there are such scholars, who have a broad knowledge of things and are equipped with many abilities, how can the country make use of them?

Questions:
1. What were the reformers’ goals?
2. What kind of changes did they advocate to reach these goals?
3. How did these ideas embrace Western ideas? How did they reject or modify them?
4. Of what value were their culture’s own traditional ideas?
26.1 Rupert Brooke: The Soldier

Rupert Brooke (1887–1915) joined the Royal Navy at the outbreak of World War I. He died of blood poisoning in Greece in 1915. In contrast to many of his fellow war poets, Brooke presented a positive, patriotic vision of war.


**THE SOLDIER**

If I should die, think only this of me:
That there’s some corner of a foreign field
That is forever England. There shall be
In that rich earth a richer dust concealed;
A dust whom England bore, shaped, made aware,
Gave, once, her flowers to love, her ways to roam,
A body of England’s, breathing English air,
Washed by the rivers, blest by suns of home.

And think, this heart, all evil shed away,
A pulse in the Eternal mind, no less
Gives somewhere back the thoughts by England given,
Her sights and sounds; dreams happy as her day;
And laughter, learnt of friends; and gentleness,
In hearts at peace, under an English heaven.

**Question:**

1. Why might Brooke’s poetry have appealed to the British public? In what ways did it reflect early twentieth-century nationalism?
26.2 Siegfried Sassoon: **They**

A British officer during World War I, Siegfried Sassoon (1886–1967) was a poet and novelist. Sassoon’s writing described in stark detail the brutality and waste of war. “They” contrasts two very different visions of the nature and impact of war.


**“THEY”**

The Bishop tells us: “when the boys come back
They will not be the same; for they’ll have fought
In a just cause: they lead the last attack
On Anti-Christ; their comrades’ blood has bought
New right to breed an honourable race,
They have challenged Death and dared him face to face.”

“We’re none of us the same!” the boys reply.
“For George lost both his legs; and Bill’s stone blind;
Poor Jim’s shot through the lungs and like to die;
And Bert’s gone syphilitic; you’ll not find
A chap who’s served that hasn’t found some change.”

And the Bishop said: “The ways of God are strange!”
Oct. 31, 1916

**Question:**

1. In the view of the Bishop in Sassoon’s poem, what kinds of changes are produced in soldiers by the experience of war? What kinds of changes do the soldiers see in themselves?
### 26.3 Isaac Rosenberg: Dead Man’s Dump

A poet and painter, Isaac Rosenberg (1890–1918) is best known for his war poetry. He was killed in action in 1918. “Dead Man’s Dump” depicted the carnage of a World War I battlefield.


---

**DEAD MAN’S DUMP**

The plunging limbers over the shattered track
Racketed with their rusty freight,
Stuck out like many crowns of thorns,
And the rusty stakes like scepters old
To stay the flood of brutish men
Upon our brothers dear.

The wheels lurched over sprawled dead
But pained them not, though their bones crunched,
Their shut mouths made no moan.
They lie there huddled, friend and foeman
Man born of man, and born of woman,
And shells go crying over them
From night till night and now.

Earth has waited for them,
All the time of their growth
Fretting for their decay:
Now she has them at last!
In the strength of their strength
Suspended—stopped and held.

What fierce imaginings their dark souls lit?
Earth! have they gone into you?
Somewhere they must have gone,
And flung on your hard back
Is their soul’s sack,
Emptied of God-ancestral essences.
Who hurled them out? Who hurled?

None saw their spirits’ shadow shake the grass,
Or stood aside for the half-used life to pass
Out of those doomed nostrils and the doomed mouth,
When the swift iron burning bee
Drained the wild honey of their youth.

What of us who, flung on the shrieking pyre,
Walk, our usual thoughts untouched,
Our lucky limbs as on ichor fed,
Immortal seeming ever?
Perhaps when the flames beat loud on us,

---

1 Two-wheeled vehicles for pulling guns or caissons.
2 In Greek mythology, the ethereal fluid that flowed in the veins of the gods.
A fear may choke in our veins  
And the startled blood may stop.

The air is loud with death,  
The dark air spurts with fire,  
The explosions ceaseless are.  
Timelessly now, some minutes past,  
These dead strode time with vigorous life,  
Till the shrapnel called “An end!”  
But not to all. In bleeding pangs  
Some borne on stretchers dreamed of home,  
Dear things, war-blotted from their hearts.

A man’s brains splattered on  
A stretcher-bearer’s face;  
His shook shoulders slipped their load,  
But when they bent to look again  
The drowning soul was sunk too deep  
For human tenderness.

They left this dead with the older dead,  
Stretched at the crossroads.  
Burnt black by strange decay  
Their sinister faces like;  
The lid over each eye,  
The grass and coloured clay  
More motion have than they,  
Joined to the great sunk silences.

Here is one not long dead;  
His dark hearing caught our far wheels,  
And the choked soul stretched weak hands  
To reach the living word the far wheels said,  
The blood-dazed intelligence beating for light,  
Crying through the suspense of the far torturing wheels  
Swift for the end to break.

Or the wheels to break,  
Cried as the tide of the world broke over his sight.

Will they come? Will they ever come?  
Even as the mixed hoofs of the mules,  
The quivering-bellied mules,  
And the rushing wheels all mixed  
With his tortured upturned sight.  
So we crashed round the bend,  
We heard his weak scream,  
We heard his very last sound,  
And our wheels grazed his dead face.

1917 1922

Question:  
1. What are the differences and similarities in these views of WWI combat?
26.4 Woodrow Wilson: Speech on the Fourteen Points

Woodrow Wilson (1856–1924) was the 24th President of the United States. At the peace conference that followed World War I, Wilson pushed for the adoption of a series of fourteen points that, in his opinion, would help create a new world society, one ruled by interational law and that would be free from war. Opposition at home and abroad prevented the adoption of his plan.


We entered this war because violations of right had occurred which touched us to the quick and made the life of our own people impossible unless they were corrected and the world secured once and for all against their recurrence. What we demand in this war, therefore, is nothing peculiar to ourselves. It is that the world be made fit and safe to live in; and particularly that it be made safe for every peace-loving nation which, like our own, wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression. All the peoples of the world are in effect partners in this interest, and for our own part we see very clearly that unless justice be done to others it will not be done to us. The programme of the world’s peace, therefore, is our programme; and that programme, the only possible programme, as we see it, is this:

I. Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understanding of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

III. The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

IV. Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

V. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

VI. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselshy sympathy.

VII. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

VIII. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safe-guarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.
XI. Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan states to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan states should be entered into.

XII. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely un molested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the seas and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

XIII. An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

XIV. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike. . . .

Question:
1. An underlying assumption of the Fourteen Points is that America should use its power to ensure that the world “be made fit and safe to live in . . .” Is this the proper policy of the United States? Why or why not?
26.5 Anna Eisenmenger, A German Soldier Returns Home: “A Complete Stranger”

As Sassoon’s poem “They” points out (see document 26.2 of this volume), soldiers returned from the battlefield changed men. In this excerpt from her diary, Anna Eisenmenger described the impact of the war on her son Karl.


Karl looked very ill. He had no underlinen or socks. His uniform was dirty and in rags. “Mother, I am famished!” he said, and walking straight into the kitchen without waiting for me to bring him something he began to devour our rations of bread and jam. “Forgive me, Mother, but we have got into the habit of taking what we can find.” He only greeted us very casually and did not notice until much later that Erni, who had come in to welcome him on Liesbeth’s arm, was wounded. “Hullo! So it’s caught you too!” and then, still hurriedly chewing and swallowing: “Well, just wait! We’ll pay them out yet, the war profiteers and parasites. We’ve grown wiser out there in the trenches, far wiser than we were. Everything must be changed, utterly changed.”

I got ready the bath and clean underlinen. After his bath Karl went straight to bed, but he was too excited to sleep, although it was almost 11 o’clock at night. He telephoned to Edith, and then he made us all come to his bedside, for he wanted to tell us about himself. He told us that... the Italians had gone on attacking in spite of the Armistic. For another whole day they had fired on our retreating columns in the Fellathal and had captured several divisions. That, however, was the only victory they had won. It was contemptible, but war made every one base and contemptible. He had become so too... After the proclamation of the Armistice all military discipline went to pieces. Everyone was intent only on getting home and made for home by the way that seemed to him quickest and surest. The men trampled down whatever stood in their way, even if the obstacle were their own officers. Woe to the officers who were unpopular with their men. . . In the next war there would be no one foolish enough to risk his life, they would see to that. . . Karl was evidently in a nervous, over-excited state, but he went on talking, and only after I had entreated him several times did he consent to try to get to sleep.

“We are all tired, Karl, and it is already past midnight. . . .”

“Do you know, Mother, how I feel here? In a clean bed, washed and fed? As if I were in heaven. . . Oh no, there is no heaven so beautiful. . . As if I were in a beautiful dream . . . and in that dream I shall try to find sleep.”

We left Karl’s room in order to go to bed ourselves. As I was helping Erni undress, he said: “Mother, Karl seems to me like a complete stranger.”

Although I was nervously and physically exhausted, sleep refused to close my eyelids. For a long, long time I lay awake, agitated by the horrors of the War. I found myself marvelling that civilised human beings could live through all the brutalities which war entailed for themselves and others without going utterly to pieces. . .

Questions:
1. Karl remarks that “Everything must be changed, utterly changed.” Not only had returning soldiers changed after World War I, but society’s attitude about war in general had changed. What made World War I so different from previous wars?
2. What role did technology play in this “new” kind of war?
26.6  A French Baker’s Wife’s Role in War

World War I was a total war, engulfing combatants and non-combatants alike. In the narrative included below, the author described the life of a French baker’s wife during wartime.


Alongside those who grow wheat are those who produce bread. The bakers’ wives as well as farmers’ wives have merited their country’s praise. As President [Briand] said of them, “Their husbands are mobilized and we can observe mobilization equal to that of soldiers in the fire of their bakeries.” In a city where one can find plenty of assistance the task, although arduous, is not beyond feminine capacity. But in certain little villages one can see women taking on all the work alone.

Such is the case of the baker’s wife of Faux Fresnay who told a woman journalist how, situated on a road which in September 1914 was thronged with refugees from northern France and with soldiers in retreat, she took on, for their sake, the difficult work of the bread oven and kneading trough.

“It was during the battle of the Maine, the Germans were at Connnatre [nearby], and the whole area had been evacuated. I alone stayed on with my mother, hoping by my presence to save my house from pillage. Everybody had run away, not wanting to suffer the horrors of an occupying army. From September 4 onwards, there was a continuous stream of refugees trudging along by the thousand, and wounded soldiers who were trying to rejoin their comrades. Most of them had had nothing to eat for four days and begged for bread.

What was to be done? Well, I went down the steps to the bakery to relight the oven and try to do what I had so often watched my husband doing. I was helped by my old mother, and night and day without stopping, while the battle raged, we baked bread.

The first evening, utterly exhausted, I cried for a long time in a corner of the bakery. But the poor people going by, more numerous every day, snatched the hot round loaves from the oven before they were properly baked through. Unfortunately, the next morning the machine which kneaded the dough broke down. A major in the medical corps seeing our distress repaired the machine after a fashion, but we now used our hands to knead the dough. The task was more tiring, but at least we made certain of getting the batches of loaves done.

Until September 8 my mother and I did nor leave the bakery, nor did we sleep a single moment, and when we heard of the victory on the Maine we fairly died of joy; we hugged each other and cried.

Since then I have gone on working, and here we are, two years later, supplying bread to Faux Fresnay and the nearby villages, baking regularly for two hundred customers. We begin to make the bread at two o’clock in the morning, and each day we use up two sackfuls of flour. At midday we have a quick meal, my mother and I, and then we set off to deliver bread to our customers; that takes until seven o’clock in the evening. When we get back from our deliveries we have to rub down the horse, and then we have to split wood [for heating the oven].

By now we are used to our hard life and we have never been ill, not for a single instant. So you see it was a very easy decision to make.”

Questions:
1. Why did the baker’s wife first begin baking after her husband went to war?
2. Why do you think she had not resumed the business earlier?
3. What does this experience illustrate about the effect of war on non-combatants?
26.7 Non-European’s View of the Start of World War I

Huda Shaarawi, an Egyptian aristocrat, traveled to Europe with her family on the eve of World War I. In the following excerpt, she presents her impressions of the coming war and of the Europeans’ opinions.


**A EUROPEAN SUMMER ON THE EVE OF WAR**

I had to leave my mother behind, sick in bed, because the doctor forbade her to travel, although he assured us that she would be all right so long as she didn’t suffer any emotional shocks. I set out burdened with sadness and worry, grieving for the death of my brother’s daughter and anxious for the health of my mother and son. I had never travelled before without the company of my mother. I had the feeling I would never see her again and was about to turn back when I reach Alexandria, but my son’s condition prevented me from doing so. We departed—the Pasha, my brother, his wife, and our children.

In Paris my son was examined by doctors who advised a cure in the mountains. As my husband was in need of treatments at the mineral springs in Vittel, we decided to go there and afterwards to the mountains. Hasan, his son, a student in England, was on holiday at the time and would join us.

While we were in Paris I was invited to attend a large meeting for women who were agitating for peace and the right to vote. The meeting took place in a huge hall belonging to one of the French newspapers. Many women made speeches including Mme Sévigné, Avril de St Croix, and my friend, Marguerite Clement. I observed women, the youth and even some military officers, enthusiastically advocating peace. I was impressed. I began to think that Europeans had reached a high stage of advancement, but was soon disabused of that idea. On the following day, I attended a lecture on psychological illnesses given by the well-known professor, Père Villon, the brother of a friend of mine. When I congratulated him on the talk, he said he had heard I had attended the peace meeting the day before. ‘Are you a supporter of peace?’ I said, ‘Yes.’ ‘How can that be when you are an Egyptian and your country is occupied by the British army?’ I replied, ‘I believe in the victory of justice over force.’ ‘Will the British leave your country peacefully? Would it be in their own interests to do so? Mlle Clement must have influenced you,’ he said, ‘I am among Frenchmen who await the day we can return the insult of the Germans.’ I said I was sorry to hear him speak like that, especially after having witnessed the spirit of harmony between French and Germans at the meeting. I expressed the hope that he would change his mind. He answered, ‘I hope you will come around to my way of thinking.’

While the Pasha was concluding his treatment at Vittel, I did some shopping in Paris. The hotels were filled up with summer visitors and had no room for Hasan and me. So, we stayed with my maid, Margaret, at a flat belonging to my brother. I was surprised to find the streets of Paris quiet, the cafés closed at night and faces sad and uneasy. I heard talk of the possibility of war between France and Germany which I refused to believe. Europe seemed too civilized and enlightened to resort to war, the most brutal act imaginable. When my friend, Marguerite Clement, visited me, her face was pale and she was bent as if carrying a heavy burden. She said that the international situation was grave and war was likely. When I asked what she and her colleagues in the peace movement would do, she said, ‘We will stand by our people. But, our voice is still weak.’ Despite these grim words I could not believe war would come.

The train back to Vittel was uncharacteristically empty. The Pasha and children who were waiting anxiously for us at the station said that the hotel was empty and that the local inhabitants were leaving the town because it was close to the border and they feared hostilities between the French and Germans. That was on 29 July. The hotel employees were sad, especially the maids, because their husbands had been called up. The manager, preparing to deliver sacks of money to the bank, said he was ordered to close the hotel. My husband asked him to change fifty French pounds and the manager, silent for a moment, replied, ‘At your service, even though this is not allowed.’
We left Vittel for Switzerland the first of August. We were supposed to change trains a few hours later for one with a dining car, but the second train did not appear. When it grew late we asked the station master what had happened and he answered brusquely, ‘Is this a time for touring, especially with children?’ We did not know till that moment that it was mobilization day. Trains moved past filled with soldiers waving flags and singing patriotic songs while women with tears in their eyes were bidding them farewell. Later we were able to board another train for Switzerland.

Questions:
1. What were the reaction of Europeans to the declaration of war?
2. What were Shaarawi’s reactions to the declaration of war and to the Europeans’ reactions? Why?
3. What do we learn about Europe and its perception by a non-European aristocrat?
26.8 Pressing for Peace

While World War I dragged on, some women were active in trying to stop the war. While the efforts of the International Congress of Women did not succeed in the short term, these efforts did provide a basis for peace and for Wilson’s 14 Points in 1918.


Here in America, on neutral soil, far removed from the stress of the conflict we, the envoys to the Governments from the International Congress of Women at The Hague, have come together to canvass the results of our missions. We put forth this statement as our united and deliberate conclusions.

At a time when the foreign offices of the great belligerents have been barred to each other, and the public mind of Europe has been fixed on the war offices for leadership, we have gone from capital to capital and conferred with the civil governments.

Our mission was to place before belligerent and neutral alike the resolutions of the International Congress of Women held at The Hague in April; especially to place before them the definite method of a conference of neutral nations as an agency of continuous mediation for the settlement of the war.

To carry out this mission two delegations were appointed, which included women of Great Britain, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United States. One or other of these delegations were received by the governments in fourteen capitals, Berlin, Berne, Budapest, Christiania, Copenhagen, The Hague, Havre (Belgian Government), London, Paris, Petrograd, Rome, Stockholm, Vienna, and Washington. We were received by the Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers of the Powers, by the King of Norway, by the Presidents of Switzerland and of the United States, by the Pope and the Cardinal Secretary of State. In many capitals more than one audience was given, not merely to present our resolutions, but for a thorough discussion. In addition to the thirty-five governmental visits we met—everywhere—members of parliaments and other leaders of public opinion.

We heard much the same words spoken in Downing Street as those spoken in Wilhelmstrasse, in Vienna, as in Petrograd, in Budapest, as in the Havre, where the Belgians have their temporary government.

Our visits to the war capitals convinced us that the belligerent Governments would not be opposed to a conference of neutral nations; that while the belligerents have rejected offers of mediation by single neutral nations, and while no belligerent could ask for mediation, the creation of a continuous conference of neutral nations might provide the machinery which would lead to peace. We found that the neutrals on the other hand were concerned, lest calling such a conference might be considered inopportune by one or other of the belligerents. Here our information from the belligerents themselves gave assurance that such initiative would not be resented. “My country would not find anything unfriendly in such action by the neutrals,” was the assurance given us by the foreign Minister of one of the great belligerents. “My Government would place no obstacle in the way of its institution,” said the Minister of an opposing nation. “What are the neutrals waiting for?” said a third, whose name ranks high not only in his own country, but all over the world.

It remained to put this clarifying intelligence before the neutral countries. As a result the plan of starting mediation through the agency of a continuous conference of the neutral nations is to-day being seriously discussed alike in the Cabinets of the belligerent and neutral countries of Europe and in the press of both.

We are in a position to quote some of the expressions of men high in the councils of the great nations as to the feasibility of the plan. “You are right,” said one Minister, “that it would be of the greatest importance to finish the fight by early negotiation rather than by further military efforts, which would result in more and more destruction and irreparable loss.” “Yours is the sanest proposal that has been brought to this office in the last six months,” said the Prime Minister of one of the larger countries.

We were also in position to canvass the objections that have been made to the proposal, testing it out severely in the judgment of those in the midst of the European conflict. It has been argued that it is not the time at present to start such a process of negotiations, and that no step should be taken until one or other party has a victory, or at least until some new military balance is struck. The answer we bring is that every delay makes more difficult the beginnings of negotiations, more nations become involved, and the situation becomes more complicated; that when at times in the course of the war such a balance was struck, the neutrals were unprepared to act. The opportunity passed. For the forces of peace to be unprepared when the hour comes, is as irretrievable as for a military leader to be unready.
It has been argued that for such a conference to be called at any time when one side has met with some military advantage, would be to favor that side. The answer we bring is that the proposed conference would start mediation at a higher level than that of military advantage. As to the actual military situation, however, we quote a remark made to us by a foreign Minister of one of the belligerent Powers. “Neither side is to-day strong enough to dictate terms, and neither side is so weakened that it has to accept humiliating terms.”

It has been suggested that such a conference would bind the neutral governments cooperating in it. The answer we bring is that, as proposed, such a conference should consist of the ablest persons of the neutral countries, assigned not to problems of their own governments, but to the common service of a supreme crisis. The situation calls for a conference cast in a new and larger mould than those of conventional diplomacy...

Questions:
1. What activities did the women engage in to try to bring about peace?
2. How did these activities fit (or not) with nineteenth-century categories of male and female spheres of behavior?
3. Why do you think the women were engaged in this activity? What allowed them to speak with the heads of state of all the warring and neutral parties in the midst of war?
26.9 Georges Clemenceau Presents the French Demands at the Paris Peace Conference

While Woodrow Wilson was seeking to establish a new world made safe for democracy, by self-determination of nations and a League of Nations, the French Premier Georges Clemenceau had a different kind of post-war settlement in mind. Most of the fighting on the western front had taken place in France, and the French demanded both revenge and security against future German aggression. Some ten years after the Paris Peace Conference, Clemenceau explains reasons for this point of view.


For the catastrophe of 1914 the Germans are responsible. Only a professional liar would deny this....

What after all is this war, prepared, undertaken, and waged by the German people, who flung aside every scruple of conscience to let it loose, hoping for a peace of enslavement under the yoke of a militarism destructive of all human dignity? It is simply the continuance, the recrudescence, of those never-ending acts of violence by which the first savage tribes carried out their depredations with all the resources of barbarism. The means improve with the ages. The ends remain the same...

Germany, in this matter, was unfortunate enough to allow herself (in spite of her skill at dissimulation) to be betrayed into an excess of candour by her characteristic tendency to go to extremes. Deutschland über alles. Germany above everything! That, and nothing less, is what she asks, and when once her demand is satisfied she will let you enjoy a peace under the yoke. Not only does she make no secret of her aim, but the intolerable arrogance of the German aristocracy, the servile good nature of the intellectual and the scholar, the gross vanity of the most competent leaders in industry, and the wide-spread influence of a violent popular poetry conspire to shatter throughout the world all the time-honoured traditions of individual, as well as international, dignity...

On November 11, 1918, the fighting ceased.

It is not I who will dispute the German soldier’s qualities of endurance. But he had been promised a fresh and frolicsome war, and for four years he had been pinned down between the anvil and the hammer.... Our defeat would have resulted in a relapse of human civilization into violence and bloodshed....

Outrages against human civilization are in the long run defeated by their own excess, and thus I discern in the peculiar mentality of the German soldier, with his “Deutschland über alles,” the cause of the premature exhaustion that brought him to beg for an armistice before the French soldier, who was fighting for his independence....

And what is this “Germanic civilization,” this monstrous explosion of the will to power, which threatens openly to do away entirely with the diversities established by many evolutions, to set in their place the implacable mastery of a race whose lordly part would be to substitute itself, by force of arms, for all national developments? We need only read [General Friedrich von] Bernhardi’s famous pamphlet Our Future, in which it is alleged that Germany sums up within herself, as the historian Treitschke asserts, the greatest manifestation of human supremacy, and finds herself condemned, by her very greatness, either to absorb all nations in herself or to return to nothingness.... Ought we not all to feel menaced in our very vitals by this mad doctrine of universal Germanic supremacy over England, France, America, and every other country?

What document more suitable to reveal the direction of “German culture” than the famous manifesto of the ninety-three super-intellectuals of Germany,1 issued to justify the bloodiest and the least excusable of military aggressions against the great centres of civilization? At the moment... violated Belgium lay beneath the heel of the malefactor (October 1914).... [and German troops were] razing... great historical buildings to the ground [and) burning down..., libraries. It would need a whole book to tell of the infamous treatment inflicted upon noncombatants, to reckon up those who were shot down, or put to death, or deported, or condemned to forced labour....

Well, this was the hour chosen by German intellectuals to make themselves heard. Let all the nations give ear! Their learning made of them merely Germans better than all others qualified to formulate, on their own account, the extravagances of Germanic arrogance. The only difference is that they speak louder than the common people, those docile automatons. The fact is that they really believe themselves to be the representatives of a privileged “culture” that sets them above the errors of the human race and confers on them the prerogative of a superior power....

The whole document is nothing but denials without the support of a single proof. “It is not true that Germany wanted the War.” [Kaiser] William II had for years been “mocked at by his adversaries of today on account of his unshakable love of peace.” They neglect to tell us whence they got this lie. They forget that from 1871 till 1914 we received from
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Germany a series of war threats in the course of which Queen Victoria and also the Czar had to intervene with the Kaiser direct for the maintenance of peace.

I have already recalled how our German intellectuals account for the violation of the Belgian frontier:

It is not true that we criminally violated Belgian neutrality, it can be proved that France and England had made up their minds to violate it. It can be proved that Belgium was willing. It would have been suicide not to forestall them....

And when a great chemist such as Ostwald tells us, with his colleagues, that our struggle “against the so-called German militarism” is really directed “against German culture,” we must remember that this same savant published a history of chemistry IN WHICH THE NAME OF [eighteenth-century French chemist Antoine] LA VOISIER WAS NOT MENTIONED.

The “intellectuals” take their place in public opinion as the most ardent propagandists of the thesis which makes Germany the very model of the “chosen people.” The same Professor Ostwald had already written, “Germany has reached a higher stage of civilization than the other peoples, and the result of the War will be an organization of Europe under German leadership.” Professor Haeckel had demanded the conquest of London, the division of Belgium between Germany and Holland, the annexation of North-east France, of Poland, the Baltic Provinces, the Congo, and a great part of the English colonies. Professor Lasson went further still:

We are morally and intellectually superior to all men. We are peerless. So too are our organizations and our institutions. Germany is the most perfect creation known in history, and the Imperial Chancellor, Herr von Berhmann-Hollweg, is the most eminent of living men.

Ordinary laymen who talked in this strain would be taken off to some safe asylum. Coming from duly hallmarked professors, such statements explain all German warfare by alleging that Germany’s destiny is universal domination, and that for this very reason she is bound either to disappear altogether or to exercise violence on all nations with a view to their own betterment....

May I further recall, since we have to emphasize the point, that on September 17, 1914, Erzberger, the well-known German statesman, an eminent member of the Catholic Party, wrote to the Minister of War, General von Falkenhayn, “We must not worry about committing an offence against the rights of nations nor about violating the laws of humanity. Such feelings today are of secondary importance”? A month later, on October 21, 1914, he wrote in Der Tag, “If a way was found of entirely wiping out the whole of London it would be more humane to employ it than to allow the blood of A SINGLE GERMAN SOLDIER to be shed on the battlefield!”.

... General von Bernhardi himself, the best pupil, as I have already said, of the historian Treitschke, whose ideas are law in Germany, has just preached the doctrine of “World power or Downfall” at us. So there is nothing left for other nations, as a way of salvation, but to be conquered by Germany.

I have sometimes penetrated into the sacred cave of the Germanic cult, which is, as every one knows, the Bierhaus [beer hall]. A great aisle of massive humanity where there accumulate, amid the fumes of tobacco and beer, the popular rumblings of a nationalism upheld by the sonorous brasses blaring to the heavens the supreme voice of Germany, “Deutschland über alles!” Men, women, and children, all petrified in reverence before the divine stoneware pot, brows furrowed with irrepressible power, eyes lost in a dream of infinity, mouths twisted by the intensity of will-power, drink in long draughts the celestial hope of vague expectations. These only remain to be realized presently when the chief marked our by Destiny shall have given the word. There you have the ultimate framework of an old but childish race.

Questions:
1. What are the causes of World War I, according to Clemenceau? Do you consider his views accurate or biased?
2. How reasonable and well-founded are Clemenceau’s reasons for his feelings against Germany?
27.1 Werner Heisenberg: Uncertainty

Werner Heisenberg of Germany (1901–1976) won the Nobel Prize for physics at the age of thirty-one for his 1927 principle of “uncertainty.” He stated that the behavior of subatomic particles cannot be observed or known. Instead, scientists can only work out probabilities for large numbers of them; no single law, therefore, governs all physical phenomena. This almost “chaotic” principle upset the central concept established by Isaac Newton in the seventeenth century that all behavior of the physical universe can be understood and predicted. Heisenberg, in a book written after the Second World War, explores the implications of uncertainty on that world view and for our future.


... The nineteenth century developed an extremely rigid frame for natural science which formed not only science but also the general outlook of great masses of people. This frame was supported by the fundamental concepts of classical physics, space, time, matter and causality; the concept of reality applied to the things or events that we could perceive by our senses or that could be observed by means of the refined tools that technical science had provided. Matter was the primary reality. The progress of science was pictured as a crusade of conquest into the material world. Utility was the watchword of the time.

On the other hand, this frame was so narrow and rigid that it was difficult to find a place in it for many concepts of our language that had always belonged to its very substance, for instance, the concepts of mind, of the human soul or of life. Mind could be introduced into the general picture only as a kind of mirror of the material world; and when one studied the properties of this mirror in the science of psychology, the scientists were always tempted—if I may carry the comparison further—to pay more attention to its mechanical than to its optical properties. Even there one tried to apply the concepts of classical physics, primarily that of causality. In the same way life was to be explained as a physical and chemical process, governed by natural laws, completely determined by causality. Darwin’s concept of evolution provided ample evidence for this interpretation. It was especially difficult to find in this framework room for those parts of reality that had been the object of the traditional religion and seemed now more or less only imaginary. Therefore, in those European countries in which one was wont to follow the ideas up to their extreme consequences, an open hostility of science toward religion developed, and even in the other countries there was an increasing tendency toward indifference toward such questions; only the ethical values of the Christian religion were excepted from this trend, at least for the time being. Confidence in the scientific method and in rational thinking replaced all other safeguards of the human mind.

Coming back now to the contributions of modern physics, one may say that the most important change brought about by its results consists in the dissolution of this rigid frame of concepts of the nineteenth century. Of course many attempts had been made before to get away from this rigid frame which seemed obviously too narrow for an understanding of the essential parts of reality. But it had not been possible to see what could be wrong with the fundamental concepts like matter, space, time and causality that had been so extremely successful in the history of science. Only experimental research itself, carried out with all the refined equipment that technical science could offer, and its mathematical interpretation, provided the basis for a critical analysis—or, one may say, enforced the critical analysis—of these concepts, and finally resulted in the dissolution of the rigid frame.

This dissolution took place in two distinct stages. The first was the discovery, through the theory of relativity, that even such fundamental concepts as space and time could be changed and in fact must be changed on account of new experience. This change did not concern the somewhat vague concepts of space and time in natural language; but it did concern their precise formulation in the scientific language of Newtonian mechanics, which had erroneously been accepted as final. The second stage was the discussion of the concept of matter enforced by the experimental results concerning the atomic structure. The idea of the reality of matter had probably been the strongest part in that rigid frame of concepts of the nineteenth century, and this idea had at least to be modified in connection with the new experience. Again the concepts so far as they belonged to the natural language remained untouched. There was no difficulty in speaking about matter or about facts or about reality when one had to describe the atomic experiments and their results. But the scientific extrapolation of these concepts into the smallest parts of matter could not be done in the simple way suggested by classical physics, though it had erroneously determined the general outlook on the problem of matter.
These new results had first of all to be considered as a serious warning against the somewhat forced application of scientific concepts in domains where they did not belong. The application of the concepts of classical physics, e.g., in chemistry, had been a mistake. Therefore, one will nowadays be less inclined to assume that the concepts of physics, even those of quantum theory, can certainly be applied everywhere in biology or other sciences. We will, on the contrary, try to keep the doors open for the entrance of new concepts even in those parts of science where the older concepts have been very useful for the understanding of the phenomena. Especially at those points where the application of the older concepts seems somewhat forced or appears not quite adequate to the problem we will try to avoid any rash conclusions.

Furthermore, one of the most important features of the development and the analysis of modern physics is the experience that the concepts of natural language, vaguely defined as they are, seem to be more stable in the expansion of knowledge than the precise terms of scientific language, derived as an idealization from only limited groups of phenomena. This is in fact not surprising since the concepts of natural language are formed by the immediate connection with reality; they represent reality. It is true that they are not very well defined and may therefore also undergo changes in the course of the centuries, just as reality itself did, but they never lose the immediate connection with reality. On the other hand, the scientific concepts are idealizations; they are derived from experience obtained by refined experimental tools, and are precisely defined through axioms and definitions. Only through these precise definitions is it possible to connect the concepts with a mathematical scheme and to derive mathematically the infinite variety of possible phenomena in this field. But through this process of idealization and precise definition the immediate connection with reality is lost. The concepts still correspond very closely to reality in that part of nature which had been the object of the research. But the correspondence may be lost in other parts containing other groups of phenomena.

The general trend of human thinking in the nineteenth century had been toward an increasing confidence in the scientific method and in precise rational terms, and had led to a general skepticism with regard to those concepts of natural language which do not fit into the closed frame of scientific thought—for instance, those of religion. Modern physics has in many ways increased this skepticism; but it has at the same time turned it against the overestimation of precise specific concepts, against a too-optimistic view on progress in general, and finally against skepticism itself. The skepticism against precise scientific concepts does not mean that there should be a definite limitation for the application of rational thinking. On the contrary, one may say that the human ability to understand may be in a certain sense unlimited. But the existing scientific concepts cover always only a very limited part of reality, and the other part that has not yet been understood is infinite. Whenever we proceed from the known into the unknown we may hope to understand, but we may have to learn at the same time a new meaning of the word “understanding.” We know that any understanding must be based finally upon the natural language because it is only there that we can be certain to touch reality, and hence we must be skeptical about any skepticism with regard to this natural language and its essential concepts. Therefore, we may use these concepts as they have been used at all times. In this way modern physics has perhaps opened the door to a wider outlook on the relation between the human mind and reality.

This modern science, then, penetrates in our time into other parts of the world where the cultural tradition has been entirely different from the European civilization. There the impact of this new activity in natural and technical science must make itself felt even more strongly than in Europe, since changes in the conditions of life that have taken two or three centuries in Europe will take place there within a few decades. One should expect that in many places this new activity must appear as a decline of the older culture, as a ruthless and barbarian attitude, that upsets the sensitive balance on which all human happiness rests. Such consequences cannot be avoided; they must be taken as one aspect of our time. But even there the openness of modern physics may help to some extent to reconcile the older traditions with the new trends of thought. For instance, the great scientific contribution in theoretical physics that has come from Japan since the last war may be an indication for a certain relationship between philosophical ideas in the tradition of the Far East and the philosophical substance of quantum theory. It may be easier to adapt oneself to the quantum-theoretical concept of reality when one has not gone through the naive materialistic way of thinking that still prevailed in Europe in the first decades of this century.
Of course such remarks should not be misunderstood as an underestimation of the damage that may be done or has been done to old cultural traditions by the impact of technical progress. But since this whole development has for a long time passed far beyond any control by human forces, we have to accept it as one of the most essential features of our time and must try to connect it as much as possible with the human values that have been the aim of the older cultural and religious traditions. It may be allowed at this point to quote a story from the Hasidic religion:1—There was an old rabbi, a priest famous for his wisdom, to whom all people came for advice. A man visited him in despair over all the changes that went on around him, deploring all the harm done by so-called technical progress. “Isn’t all this technical nuisance completely worthless,” he exclaimed, “if one considers the real values of life?” “This may be so,” the rabbi replied, “but if one has the right attitude one can learn from everything.” “No,” the visitor rejoined, “from such foolish things as railway or telephone or telegraph one can learn nothing whatsoever.” But the rabbi answered, “You are wrong. From the railway you can learn that you may by being one instant late miss everything. From the telegraph you can learn that every word counts. And from the telephone you can learn that what we say here can be heard there.” The visitor understood what the rabbi meant and went away.

Finally, modern science penetrates into those large areas of our present world in which new doctrines were established only a few decades ago as foundations for new and powerful societies. There modern science is confronted both with the content of the doctrines, which go back to European philosophical ideas of the nineteenth century (Hegel and Marx), and with the phenomenon of uncompromising belief. Since modern physics must play a great role in these countries because of its practical applicability, it can scarcely be avoided that the narrowness of the doctrines is felt by those who have really understood modern physics and its philosophical meaning. Therefore, at this point an interaction between science and the general trend of thought may take place. Of course the influence of science should not be overrated; but it might be that the openness of modern science could make it easier even for larger groups of people to see that the doctrines are possibly not so important for the society as had been assumed before. In this way the influence of modern science may favor an attitude of tolerance and thereby may prove valuable.

On the other hand, the phenomenon of uncompromising belief carries much more weight than some special philosophical notions of the nineteenth century. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the great majority of the people can scarcely have any well-founded judgment concerning the correctness of certain important general ideas or doctrines. Therefore, the word “belief” can for this majority not mean “perceiving the truth of something” but can only be understood as “taking this as the basis for life.” One can easily understand that this second kind of belief is much firmer, is much more fixed than the first one, that it can persist even against immediate contradicting experience and can therefore not be shaken by added scientific knowledge.... It is true that cautious deliberation based on purely rational arguments can save us from many errors and dangers, since it allows readjustment to new situations, and this may be a necessary condition for life. But remembering our experience in modern physics it is easy to see that there must always be a fundamental complementarity between deliberation and decision. In the practical decisions of life it will scarcely ever be possible to go through all the arguments in favor of or against one possible decision, and one will therefore always have to act on insufficient evidence.2 The decision finally takes place by pushing away all the arguments—both those that have been understood and others that might come up through further deliberation—and by cutting off all further pondering.... Even the most important decisions in life must always contain this inevitable element of irrationality. The decision itself is necessary, since there must be something to rely upon, some principle to guide our actions. Without such a firm stand our own actions would lose all force. Therefore, it cannot be avoided that some real or apparent truth form the basis of life; and this fact should be acknowledged with regard to those groups of people whose basis is different from our own.

---

1 A Jewish mystical sect founded in Poland around 1750.
2 Emphasis by the editors.
Coming now to a conclusion from all that has been said about modern science, one may perhaps state that modern physics is just one, but a very characteristic, part of a general historical process that tends toward a unification and a widening of our present world. This process would in itself lead to a diminution of those cultural and political tensions that create the great danger of our time. Modern physics plays perhaps only a small role in this dangerous process of unification. But it helps at two very decisive points to guide the development into a calmer kind of evolution. First, it shows that the use of arms in the process would be disastrous and, second, through its openness for all kinds of concepts it raises the hope that in the final state of unification many different cultural traditions may live together and may combine different human endeavors into a new kind of balance between thought and deed, between activity and meditation.

**Questions:**
1. How was the rigid framework of Newtonian physics shown to be insufficient for explaining reality?
2. What is the problem in applying scientific concepts and language to explain other domains?
3. How might the scientific principles of uncertainty guide human society toward a more tolerant future?
27.2 Jean-Paul Sartre: Existentialism

Existentialism developed as an answer to the anxiety and uncertainty in Western culture that resulted from the breakdown of traditional beliefs, technological innovations, and two world wars. The movement attempted to find a new basis for ethical behavior in an ambiguous and irrational world. Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980), the most influential existentialist, was a French philosopher, writer, and political activist. Having fought in the French resistance until taken prisoner by the Germans during World War II, Sartre tested his existential philosophy in his own courageous life.

When we conceive God as the Creator, He is generally thought of as a superior sort of artisan. Whatever doctrine we may be considering, whether one like that of Descartes or that of Leibnitz,1 we always grant that will more or less follows understanding or, at the very least, accompanies it, and that when God creates He knows exactly what He is creating. Thus, the concept of man in the mind of God is comparable to the concept of paper-cutter in the mind of the manufacturer, and, following certain techniques and a conception, God produces man, just as the artisan, following a definition and a technique, makes a paper-cutter. Thus, the individual man is the realization of a certain concept in the divine intelligence.

In the eighteenth century, the atheism of the philosophes discarded the idea of God, but not so much the notion that essence precedes existence. To a certain extent, this idea is found everywhere; we find it in Diderot, in Voltaire, and even in Kant.2 Man has a human nature; this human nature, which is the concept of the human, is found in all men, which means that each man is a particular example of a universal concept, man. In Kant, the result of this universality is that the wild—man, the natural man, as well as the bourgeois, are circumscribed by the same definition and have the same basic qualities. Thus, here too the essence of man precedes the historical existence that we find in nature.

Atheistic existentialism, which I represent, is more coherent. It states that if God does not exist, there is at least one being in whom existence precedes essence, a being who exists before he can be defined by any concept, and that this being is man, or, as Heidegger says, human reality. What is meant here by saying that existence precedes essence? It means that, first of all, man exists, turns up, appears on the scene, and, only afterward, defines himself. If man, as the existentialist conceives him, is indefinable, it is because at first he is nothing. Only afterward will he be something, and he himself will have made what he will be. Thus, there is no human nature, since there is no God to conceive it. Not only is man what he conceives himself to be, but he is also only what he wills himself to be after this thrust toward existence.

Man is nothing else but what he makes of himself. Such is the first principle of existentialism. It is also what is called subjectivity, the name we are labeled with when charges are brought against us. But what do we mean by this, if not that man has a greater dignity than a stone or table? For we mean that man first exists, that is, that man first of all is the being who hurls himself toward a future and who is conscious of imagining himself as being in the future. Man is at the start a plan which is aware of itself, rather than a patch of moss, a piece of garbage, or a cauliflower; nothing exists prior to this plan; there is nothing in heaven; dun will be what he will have planned to be. Not what he will want to be. Because by the word “will” we generally mean a conscious decision, which is subsequent to what we have already made of ourselves. I may want to belong to a political party, write a book, get married; but all that is only a manifestation of an earlier, more spontaneous choice that is called “will.” But if existence really does precede essence, man is responsible for what he is. Thus, existentialism’s first move is to make every man aware of what he is and to make the full responsibility of his existence rest on him. And when we say that a man is responsible for himself, we do not only mean that he is responsible for his own individuality, but that he is responsible for all men.

The word subjectivism has two meanings, and our opponents play on the two. Subjectivism means, on the one hand, that an individual chooses and makes himself; and, on the other, that it is impossible for man to transcend human subjectivity. The second of these is the essential meaning of existentialism. When we say that man chooses his own self, we mean that every one of us does likewise; but we also mean by that that in making this choice he also chooses all men. In fact, in creating the man that we want to be, there is not a single one of our acts which does not at the same time create

---

1 Rene Descartes (1596–1650) was a French philosopher and mathematician. Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibnitz (1646—1716) was a German philosopher, scientist, and mathematician.
2 Denis Diderot (1713–1784), a French philosopher and author who was a co-editor of the monumental Encyclopedia. (Chapter 17, Document 6)
Voltaire is the literary name of Francois Marie Arouet (1694–1778), French writer, historian, and philosopher. (Chapter 17, Document 7.) Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) was a German critical and moral philosopher (Chapter 17, Document 5).
an image of man as we think he ought to be. To choose to be this or that is to affirm at the same time the value of what we choose, because we can never choose evil. We always choose the good, and nothing can be good for us without being good for all.

If [moreover] existence precedes essence, and if we grant that we exist and fashion our image at one and the same time, the image is valid for everybody and for our whole age. Thus, our responsibility is much greater than we might have supposed, because it involves all mankind. If I am a workingman and choose to join a Christian trade union rather than be a communist, and if by being a member I want to show that the best thing for man is resignation, that the kingdom of man is not of this world, I am not only involving my own case—I want to be resigned for everyone. As a result, my action has involved all humanity. To take a more individual matter, if I want to marry, to have children; even if this marriage depends solely on my own circumstances or passion or wish, I am involving all humanity in monogamy and not merely myself. Therefore, I am responsible for myself and for everyone else. I am creating a certain image of man of my own choosing. In choosing myself, I choose man.

This helps us understand what the actual content is of such rather grandiloquent words as anguish, forlornness, despair. As you will see, it’s all quite simple.

First, what is meant by anguish? The existentialists say at once that man is anguish. What that means is this: the man who involves himself and who realizes that he is not only the person he chooses to be, but also a lawmaker who is, at the same time, choosing all mankind as well as himself, can not help escape the feeling of his total and deep responsibility. Of course, there are many people who are not anxious; but we claim that they are hiding their anxiety, that they are fleeing from it. Certainly, many people believe that when they do something, they themselves are the only ones involved, and when someone says to them, “What if everyone acted that way?” they shrug their shoulders and answer, “Everyone doesn’t act that way.” But really, one should always ask himself, “What would happen if everybody looked at things that way?” There is no escaping this disturbing thought except by a kind of double-dealing. A man who lies and makes excuses for himself by saying “not everybody does that” is someone with an uneasy conscience, because the act of lying implies that a universal value is conferred upon the lie.

... For every man, everything happens as if all mankind had its eyes fixed on him and were guiding itself by what he does. And every man ought to say to himself, “Am I really the kind of man who has the right to act in such a way that humanity might guide itself by my actions?” And if he does not say that to himself, he is masking his anguish.

There is no question here of the kind of anguish which would lead to quietism, to inaction. It is a matter of a simple sort of anguish that anybody who has had responsibilities is familiar with. For example, when a military officer takes the responsibility for an attack and sends a certain number of men to death, he chooses to do so, and in the main he alone makes the choice. Doubtless, orders come from above, but they are too broad; he interprets them, and on this interpretation depend the lives often of fourteen or twenty men. In making a decision he can not help having a certain anguish. All leaders know this anguish. That doesn’t keep them from acting; on the contrary, it is the very condition of their action. For it implies that they envisage a number of possibilities, and when they choose one, they realize that it has value only because it is chosen. We shall see that this kind of anguish, which is the kind that existentialism describes, is explained, in addition, by a direct responsibility to the other men whom it involves. It is not a curtain separating us from action, but is part of action itself.

When we speak of forlornness, we mean only that God does not exist and that we have to face all the consequences of this. The existentialist is strongly opposed to a certain kind of secular ethics which would like to abolish God with the least possible expense. About 1880, some French teachers tried to set up a secular ethics which went something like this: God is a useless and costly hypothesis; we are discarding it; but, meanwhile, in order for there to be an ethics, a society, a civilization, it is essential that certain values be taken seriously and that they be considered as having an a priori existence. It must be obligatory, a priori, to be honest, not to lie, not to beat your wife, to have children, and so forth. So we’re going to try a little device which will make it possible to show that values exist all the same, inscribed in a heaven of ideas, though otherwise God does not exist. In other words—and this, I believe, is the tendency of everything called reformism in France—nothing will be changed if God does not exist. We shall find ourselves with the same norms of honesty, progress, and humanism, and we shall have made of God an outdated hypothesis which will peacefully die off by itself.

---

3 A kind of mysticism that demanded that a person surrender totally to God. The extinction of human will and passion was considered a prerequisite for God’s entrance into the human vessel. Those who separated themselves from this world and calmly and passively meditated on God and divine things received divine grace.

4 Preceding and independent.
The existentialist, on the contrary, thinks it very distressing that God does not exist, because all possibility of finding values in a heaven of ideas disappears along with Him; there can no longer be an a priori Good, since there is no infinite and perfect consciousness to think it. Nowhere is it written that the Good exists, that we must be honest, that we must not lie because the fact is we are on a plane where there are only men. Dostoevsky\(^5\) said, “If God didn’t exist, everything would be possible.” That is the very starting point of existentialism. Indeed, everything is permissible if God does not exist, and as a result man is forlorn, because neither within him nor without does he find anything to cling to. He can’t start making excuses for himself.

If existence really does precede essence, there is no explaining things away by reference to a fixed and given human nature. In other words, there is no determinism, man is free, man is freedom. On the other hand, if God does not exist, we find no values or commands to turn to which legitimize our conduct. So, in the bright realm of values, we have no excuse behind us, nor justification before us. We are alone, with no excuses.

That is the idea I shall try to convey when I say that man is condemned to be free. Condemned, because he did not create himself, yet, in other respects is free; because, once thrown into the world, he is responsible for everything he does. The existentialist does not believe in the power of passion. He will never agree that a sweeping passion is a ravaging torrent which fatally leads a man to certain acts and is therefore an excuse. He thinks that man is responsible for his passion.

The existentialist does not think that man is going to help himself by finding in the world some omen by which to orient himself. Because he thinks that man will interpret the omen to suit himself. Therefore, he thinks that man, with no support and no aid, is condemned every moment to invent man. [A French writer and poet] has said, “Man is the future of man.” That’s exactly it. But if it is taken to mean that this future is recorded in heaven, that God sees it, then it is false, because it would really no longer be a future. If it is taken to mean that, whatever a man may be, there is a future to be forged, a virgin future before him, then this remark is sound. But then we are forlorn.

Questions:
1. What does Sartre mean when he says “existence precedes existence?”
2. How does existentialism attempt to construct a new value system without any god or religion?
3. How does existentialism relate to Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle (Document 3)? Bakunin’s anarchism (Chapter 24, Document 6)? Kafka’s work?

\(^5\) Fyoder Dostoevsky (1821–1881) was Russian novelist.
27.3 A Room of One’s Own

Virginia Woolf published her lectures to two women’s colleges, Newnham and Girton, on the topic of women and fiction as A Room of One’s Own (October 1929). Throughout the excerpt, she is considering the questions, “Why have there been no great women writers?” She begins with the metaphor of fish to refer to ideas.

But however small it was, it had, nevertheless, the mysterious property of its kind—put back into the mind, it became at once very exciting, and important; and as it darted and sank, and flashed hither and thither, set up such a wash and tumult of ideas that it was impossible to sit still. It was thus that I found myself walking with extreme rapidity across a grass plot. Instantly a man’s figure rose to intercept me. Nor did I at first understand that the gesticulations of a curious-looking object, in a cut-away coat and evening shirt, were aimed at me. His face expressed horror and indignation. Instinct rather than reason came to my help; he was a Beadle; I was a woman. This was the turf; there was the path. Only the Fellows and Scholars are allowed here; the gravel is the place for me. Such thoughts were the work of a moment. As I regained the path the arms of the Beadle sank, his face assumed its usual repose, and though turf is better walking than gravel, no very great harm was done. The only charge I could bring against the Fellows and Scholars of whatever the college might happen to be was that in protection of their turf, which has been rolled for 300 years in succession, they had sent my little fish into hiding.

What idea it had been that had sent me so audaciously trespassing I could not now remember. The spirit of peace descended like a cloud from heaven, for if the spirit of peace dwells anywhere, it is in the courts and quadrangles of Oxbridge* on a fine October morning. Strolling through those colleges past those ancient halls the roughness of the present seemed smoothed away; the body seemed contained in a miraculous glass cabinet through which no sound could penetrate, and the mind, freed from any contact with facts (unless one trespassed on the turf again), was at liberty to settle down upon whatever meditation was in harmony with the moment.

but here I was actually at the door which leads into the library itself. I must have opened it, for instantly there issued, like a guardian angel barring the way with a flutter of black gown instead of white wings, a deprecating, silvery, kindly gentleman, who regretted in a low voice as he waved me back that ladies are only admitted to the library if accompanied by a Fellow of the College or furnished with a letter of introduction.

As I leant against the wall the University indeed seemed a sanctuary in which are preserved rare types which would soon be obsolete if left to fight for existence on the pavement of the Strand.

Once, presumably, this quadrangle with its smooth lawns, its massive buildings, and the chapel itself was marsh too, where the grasses waved and the swine rooted. Teams of horses and oxen, I thought, must have hauled the stone in wagons from far countries, and then with infinite labour the grey blocks in whose shade I was now standing were poised in order one on top of another, and then the painters brought their glass for the windows, and the masons were busy for centuries up on that roof with putty and cement, spade and trowel. Every Saturday somebody must have poured gold and silver out of a leathern purse into their ancient fists, for they had their beer and skittles presumably of an evening. An unending stream of gold and silver, I thought, must have flowed into this court perpetually to keep the stones coming and the masons working; to level, to ditch, to dig and to drain. But it was then the age of faith, and money was poured liberally to set these stones on a deep foundation, and when the stones were raised, still more money was poured in from the coffers of kings and queens and great nobles to ensure that hymns should be sung here and scholars taught. Lands were granted; tithes were paid. And when the age of faith was over and the age of reason had come, still the same flow of gold and silver went on; fellowships were founded; lectureships endowed; only the gold and silver flowed now, not from the coffers of the king, but

---

* A term combining the two charter male universities in England, Oxford and Cambridge.
from the chests of merchants and manufacturers, from the purses of men who had made, say, a fortune from industry, and returned, in their wills, a bounteous share of it to endow more chairs, more lectureships, more fellowships in the university where they had learnt their craft. Hence the libraries and laboratories; the observatories; the splendid equipment of costly and delicate instruments which now stands on glass shelves, where centuries ago the grasses waved and the swine rooted. Certainly, as I strolled round the court, the foundation of gold and silver seemed deep enough; the pavement laid solidly over the wild grasses. Men with trays on their heads went busily from staircase to staircase. Gaudy blossoms flowered in window-boxes. The strains of the gramophone blared out from the rooms within. It was impossible not to reflect—the reflection whatever it may have been was cut short. The clock struck. It was time to find one’s way to luncheon.

It is a curious fact that novelists have a way of making us believe that luncheon parties are invariably memorable for something very witty that was said, or for something very wise that was done. But they seldom spare a word for what was eaten. It is part of the novelist’s convention not to mention soup and salmon and ducklings, as if soup and salmon and ducklings were of no importance whatsoever, as if nobody ever smoked a cigar or drank a glass of wine. Here, however, I shall take the liberty to defy at convention and to tell you that the lunch on this occasion began with soles, sunk in a deep dish, over which the college cook had spread a counter-pane of the whitest cream, save that it was branded here and there with brown spots like the spots on the flanks of a doe. After that came the partridges, but if this suggests a couple of bald, brown birds on a plate you are mistaken. The partridges, many and various, came with all their retinue of sauces and salads, the sharp and the sweet, each in its order; their potatoes, thin as coins but not so hard; their sprouts, foliated as rose-buds but more succulent. And no sooner had the roast and its retinue been done with than the silent serving-man, the Beadle himself perhaps in a milder manifestation, set before us, wreathed in napkins, a confection which rose all sugar from the waves. To call it pudding and so relate it to rice and tapioca would be an insult. Meanwhile the wineglasses had flushed yellow and flushed crimson; had been emptied; had been filled. And thus by degrees was lit, halfway down the spine, which is the seat of the soul, not that hard little electric light which we call brilliance, as it pops in and out upon our lips, but the more profound, subtle and subterranean glow, which is the rich yellow flame of rational intercourse. No need to hurry. No need to sparkle. No need to be anybody but oneself. We are all going to heaven and Vandyck is of the company—in other words, how good life seemed, how sweet its rewards, how trivial this grudge or that grievance, how admirable friendship and the society of one’s kind, as, lighting a good cigarette, one sunk among the cushions in the window-seat.

Here was my soup. Dinner was being served in the great dining-hall. Far from being spring it was in fact an evening in October. Everybody was assembled in the big dining-room. Dinner was ready. Here was the soup. It was a plain gravy soup. There was nothing to stir the fancy in that. One could have seen through the transparent liquid any pattern that there might have been on the plate itself. But there was no pattern. The plate was plain. Next came beef with its attendant greens and potatoes—a homely trinity, suggesting the rumps of cattle in a muddy market, and sprouts curled and yellowed at the edge, and bargaining and cheapening, and women with string bags on Monday morning. There was no reason to complain of human nature’s daily food, seeing that the supply was sufficient and coal-miners doubtless were sitting down to less. Prunes and custard followed. And if any one complains that prunes, even when mitigated by custard, are an uncharitable vegetable (fruit they are not), stringy as a miser’s heart and exuding a fluid such as might run in miser’s veins who have denied themselves wine and warmth for eighty years and yet not given to the poor, he should reflect that there are people whose charity embraces even the prune. Biscuits and cheese came next, and here the water-jug was liberally passed round, for it is the nature of biscuits to be dry, and these were biscuits to the core. That was all. The meal was over. Everybody scraped their chairs back; the swing-doors swung violently to and fro; soon the hall was emptied of every sign of food and made ready no doubt for breakfast next morning. Down corridors and up staircases the youth of England went banging and singing. And was it for a guest, a stranger (for I had no more right here in Fernham than in Trinity or Somerville or Girton or Newnham or Christchurch), to say, “The dinner was not good,” or to say (we were now, Mary Seton and I, in her sitting-room), “Could we not have dined up here alone?” for if I had said anything of the kind I should have been prying and searching into the secret economies of a house which to the stranger wears so fine a front of gaiety and courage. No, one could say nothing of the sort. Indeed, conversation for a moment flagged. The human frame being what it is, heart, body and brain all mixed together, and not contained in separate compartments as they will be no doubt in another million years, a good dinner is of great importance to good talk. One cannot think well, love well, sleep well, if one has not dined well. The lamp in the spine does not light on beef and prunes. We are all probably going to heaven, and Vandyck is, we hope, to meet us round the next corner—that is the dubious and qualifying state of mind that beef and prunes at the end of the day’s work breed between them.
At the thought of all those women working year after year and finding it hard to get two thousand pounds together, and as much as they could do to get thirty thousand pounds, we burst out in scorn at the reprehensible poverty of our sex. What had our mothers been doing then that they had no wealth to leave us? Powdering their noses? Looking in at shop windows?

Now if she had gone into business; had become a manufacturer of artificial silk or a magnate on the Stock Exchange; if she had left two or three hundred thousand pounds to Fernham, we could have been sitting at our ease tonight and the subject of our talk might have been archaeology, botany, anthropology, physics, the nature of the atom, mathematics, astronomy, relativity, geography. If only Mrs. Seton and her mother and her mother before her had learnt the great art of making money and had left their money, like their fathers and their grandfathers before them, to found fellowships and lectureships and prizes and scholarships appropriated to the use of their own sex, we might have dined very tolerably up here alone off a bird and a bottle of wine;

For, to endow a college would necessitate the suppression of families altogether. Making a fortune and bearing thirteen children—no human being could stand it. Consider the facts, we said. First there are nine months before the baby is born. Then the baby is born. Then there are three or four months spent in feeding the baby. After the baby is fed there are certainly five years spent in playing with the baby. You cannot, it seems, let children run about the streets. People who have seen them running wild in Russia say that the sight is not a pleasant one. People say, too, that human nature takes its shape in the years between one and five. If Mrs. Seton, I said, had been making money, what sort of memories would you have had of games and quarrels? What would you have known of Scotland, and its fine air and cakes and all the rest of it? But it is useless to ask these questions, because you would never have come into existence at all. Moreover, it is equally useless to ask what might have happened if Mrs. Seton and her mother and her mother before her had amassed great wealth and laid it under the foundations of college and library, because, in the first place, to earn money was impossible for them, and in the second, had it been possible, the law denied them the right to possess what money they earned.

Questions:
1. What topics and metaphors does Woolf use to address her question, “Why have there been no great women writers?”
2. What are the answers she gives to her question?
3. How is her writing an example of modern writing?
**27.4 The Depression: Germany's Unemployed**

The following article was first published in *Die Tat*, a National Socialist periodical. Heinrich Hauser describes the loss of dignity suffered by himself and the unemployed millions wandering Germany's roads and taking shelter in municipal lodging houses during the Great Depression.


An almost unbroken chain of homeless men extends the whole length of the great Hamburg-Berlin highway.

There are so many of them moving in both directions, impelled by the wind or making their way against it, that they could shout a message from Hamburg to Berlin by word of mouth.

It is the same scene for the entire two hundred miles, and the same scene repeats itself between Hamburg and Bremen, between Bremen and Kassel, between Kassel and Würzburg, between Wurzburg and Munich. All the highways in Germany over which I traveled this year presented the same aspects.

... Most of the hikers paid no attention to me. They walked separately or in small groups, with their eyes on the ground. And they had the queer, stumbling gait of barefooted people, for their shoes were slung over their shoulders.

Some of them were guild members,—carpenters with embroidered wallets, knee breeches, and broad felt hats; milkmen with striped red shirts, and bricklayers with tall black hats,—but they were in a minority. Far more numerous were those whom one could assign to no special profession or craft—unskilled young people, for the most part, who had been unable to find a place for themselves in any city or town in Germany, and who had never had a job and never expected to have one. There was something else that had never been seen before—whole families that had piled all their goods into baby carriages and wheelbarrows that they were pushing along as they plodded forward in dumb despair. It was a whole nation on the march.

I saw them—and this was the strongest impression that the year 1932 left with me—I saw them, gathered into groups of fifty or a hundred men, attacking fields of potatoes. I saw them digging up the potatoes and throwing them into sacks while the farmer who owned the field watched them in despair and the local policeman looked on gloomily from the distance. I saw them staggering toward the lights of the city as night fell, with their sacks on their backs. What did it remind me of? Of the War, of the worst periods of starvation in 1917 and 1918, but even then people paid for the potatoes....

I saw that the individual can know what is happening only by personal experience. I know what it is to be a tramp. I know what cold and hunger are. I know what it is to spend the night outdoors or behind the thin walls of a shack through which the wind whistles. I have slept in holes such as hunters hide in, in hayricks, under bridges, against the warm walls of boiler houses, under cattle shelters in pastures, on a heap of fir-tree boughs in the forest. But there are two things that I have only recently experienced—begging and spending the night in a municipal lodging house.

I entered the huge Berlin municipal lodging house in a northern quarter of the city....

There was an entrance arched by a brick vaulting, and a watchman sat in a little wooden sentry box. His white coat made him look like a doctor. We stood waiting in the corridor. Heavy steam rose from the men’s clothes. Some of them sat down on the floor, pulled off their shoes, and unwound the rags that were bound around their feet. More people were constantly pouring in the door, and we stood closely packed together. Then another door opened. The crowd pushed forward, and people began forcing their way almost eagerly through this door, for it was warm in there. Without knowing it I had already caught the rhythm of the municipal lodging house. It means waiting, waiting, standing around, and then suddenly jumping up.

We now stand in a long hall, down the length of which runs a bar dividing the hall into a narrow and a wide space. All the light is on the narrow side. There under yellow lamps that hang from the ceiling on long wires sit men in white smocks. We arrange ourselves in long lines, each leading up to one of these men, and the mill begins to grind....

... As the line passes in single file the official does not look up at each new person to appear. He only looks at the paper that is handed to him. These papers are for the most part invalid cards or unemployment certificates. The very fact that the official does not look up robs the homeless applicant of self-respect, although he may look too beaten down to feel any....

Now it is my turn and the questions and answers flow as smoothly as if I were an old hand. But finally I am asked, “Have you ever been here before?”
“No.”
“No?” The question reverberates through the whole room. The clerk refuses to believe me and looks through his card catalogue. But no, my name is not there. The clerk thinks this strange, for he cannot have made a mistake, and the terrible thing that one notices in all these clerks is that they expect you to lie. They do not believe what you say. They do not regard you as a human being but as an infection, something foul that one keeps at a distance. He goes on. “How did you come here from Hamburg?”

“By truck.”
“Where have you spent the last three nights?”
I lie coolly.
“Have you begged?”
I feel a warm blush spreading over my face. It is welling up from the bourgeois world that I have come from.

“No.”
A coarse peal of laughter rises from the line, and a loud, piercing voice grips me as if someone had seized me by the throat: “Never mind. The day will come, comrade, when there’s nothing else to do.” And the line breaks into laughter again, the bitterest laughter I have ever heard, the laughter of damnation and despair....

Again the crowd pushes back in the kind of rhythm that is so typical of a lodging house, and we are all herded into the undressing room. It is like all the other rooms except that it is divided by benches and shelves like a fourth-class railway carriage. I cling to the man who spoke to me. He is a Saxon with a friendly manner and he has noticed that I am a stranger here. A certain sensitiveness, an almost perverse, spiritual alertness makes me like him very much.

Out of a big iron chest each of us takes a coat hanger that would serve admirably to hit somebody over the head with. As we undress the room becomes filled with the heavy breath of poverty. We are so close together that we brush against each other every time we move. Anyone who has been a soldier, anyone who has been to a public bath is perfectly accustomed to the look of naked bodies. But I have never seen anything quite so repulsive as all these hundreds of withered human frames. For in the homeless army the majority are men who have already been defeated in the struggle of life, the crippled, old, and sick. There is no repulsive disease of which traces are not to be seen here. There is no form of mutilation or degeneracy that is not represented, and the naked bodies of the old men are in a disgusting state of decline....

It is superfluous to describe what follows. Towels are handed out by the same methods described above. Then nightgowns—long, sacklike affairs made of plain unbleached cotton but freshly washed. Then slippers. All at once a new sound goes up from the moving mass that has been walking silently on bare feet. The shuffling and rattling of the hard soles of the slippers ring through the corridor.

Distribution of spoons, distribution of enamelledware bowls with the words “Property of the City of Berlin” written on their sides. Then the meal itself. A big kettle is carried in. Men with yellow smocks have brought it and men with yellow smocks ladle out the food. These men, too, are homeless and they have been expressly picked by the establishment and given free food and lodging and a little pocket money in exchange for their work about the house.

Where have I seen this kind of food distribution before? In a prison that I once helped to guard in the winter of 1919 during the German civil war. There was the same hunger then, the same trembling, anxious expectation of rations. Now the men are standing in a long row, dressed in their plain nightshirts that reach to the ground, and the noise of their shuffling feet is like the noise of big wild animals walking up and down the stone floor of their cages before feeding time. The men lean far over the kettle so that the warm steam from the food envelops them and they hold out their bowls as if begging and whisper to the attendant, “Give me a real helping. Give me a little more.” A piece of bread is handed out with every bowl.

My next recollection is sitting at a table in another room on a crowded bench that is like a seat in a fourth-class railway carriage. Hundreds of hungry mouths make an enormous noise eating their food. The men sit bent over their food like animals who feel that someone is going to take it away from them. They hold their bowl with their left arm part way around it, so that nobody can take it away, and they also protect it with their other elbow and with their head and mouth, while they move the spoon as fast as they can between their mouth and the bowl....

We shuffle into the sleeping room, where each bed has a number painted in big letters on the wall over it. You must find the number that you have around your neck, and there is your bed, your home for one night. It stands in a row with fifty others and across the room there are fifty more in a row....

I curl up in a ball for a few minutes and then see that the Saxon is lying the same way, curled up in the next bed. We look at each other with eyes that understand everything.
...Only a few people, very few, move around at all. The others lie awake and still, staring at their blankets, wrapped up in themselves but not sleeping. Only an almost soldierly sense of comradeship, an inner self-control engendered by the presence of so many people, prevents the despair that is written on all these faces from expressing itself. The few who are moving about do so with the tormenting consciousness of men who merely want to kill time. They do not believe in what they are doing.

...The air is poisoned with the breath of men who have stuffed too much food into empty stomachs. There is also a sickening smell of lysol. It seems completely terrible to me, and I am not merely pitying myself. It is painful just to look at the scene. Life is no longer human here. Today, when I am experiencing this for the first time, I think that I should prefer to do away with myself, to take gas, to jump into the river, or leap from some high place, if I were ever reduced to such straits that I had to live here in the lodging house. But I have had too much experience not to mistrust even myself. If I ever were reduced so low, would I really come to such a decision? I do not know. Animals die, plants wither, but men always go on living.

Questions:
1. How did the experiences in the Depression dehumanize people?
2. How would these kinds of conditions affect people’s political and social attitudes?
27.5 Neville Chamberlain Defends the Policy of Appeasement

In 1938, Hitler demanded that Czechoslovakia give up the Sudetenland to Germany on the basis that three-quarters of the population living there were German. European leaders, including British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain (1869–1940), met in Munich and acceded to Hitler’s demands to bring “peace in our time” on September 30. Below are excerpts of two speeches of Chamberlain explaining his position at the time of the Munich Conference.


Speech to the British Nation, September 27, 1938

First of all I must say something to those who have written to my wife or myself in these last weeks to tell us of their gratitude for my efforts and to assure us of their prayers for my success. Most of these letters have come from women—mothers or sisters of our own countrymen. But there are countless others besides—from France, from Belgium, from Italy, even from Germany, and it has been heartbreaking to read of the growing anxiety they reveal and their intense relief when they thought, too soon, that the danger of war was past.

If I felt my responsibility heavy before, to read such letters has made it seem almost overwhelming. How horrible, fantastic, incredible it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas masks here because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing. It seems still more impossible that a quarrel which has already been settled in principle should be the subject of war.

I can well understand the reasons why the Czech Government have felt unable to accept the terms which have been put before them in the German memorandum. Yet I believe after my talks with Herr Hitler that, if only time were allowed, it ought to be possible for the arrangements for transferring the territory that the Czech Government has agreed to give to Germany to be settled by agreement under conditions which would assure fair treatment to the population concerned.

You know already that I have done all that one man can do to compose this quarrel. After my visits to Germany I have realized how Herr Hitler feels that he must champion other Germans, and his indignation that grievances have not been met before this. He told me privately, and last night he repeated publicly, that after this Sudeten German question is settled, that is the end of Germany’s territorial claims in Europe.

After my first visit to Berchtesgaden I did get the assent of the Czech Government to proposals which gave me the substance of what Herr Hitler wanted and I was taken completely by surprise when I got back to Germany and found that he insisted that the territory be handed over to him immediately, and immediately occupied by German troops without previous arrangement for safeguarding the people within the territory who were not Germans, or who did not want to join the German Reich...

However much we may sympathize with a small nation confronted by a big and powerful neighbour, we cannot in all circumstances undertake to involve the whole British Empire in war simply on her account. If we have to fight it must be on larger issues than that. I am myself a man of peace to the depths of my soul. Armed conflict between nations is a nightmare to me; but if I were convinced that any nation had made up its mind to dominate the world by fear of its force, I should feel that it must be resisted. Under such a domination life for people who believe in liberty would not be worth living; but war is a fearful thing, and we must be very clear, before we embark on it, that it is really the great issues that are at stake, and that the call to risk everything in their defence, when all the consequences are weighed, is irresistible.

For the present I ask you to await as calmly as you can the events of the next few days. As long as war has not begun, there is always hope that it may be prevented, and you know that I am going to work for peace to the last moment. Good night.

Speech to Britain’s House of Commons, on October 6, 1938

Since I first went [to meet with Hitler in Germany] more than 20,000 letters and telegrams have come to No. 10, Downing Street.1 Of course, I have only been able to look at a tiny fraction of them, but I have seen enough to know that the people who wrote did not feel that they had such a cause for which to fight, if they were asked to go to war in order that the Sudeten Germans might not join the Reich. That is how they are feeling. That is my answer to those who say that we should have told Germany weeks ago that, if her army crossed the border of Czechoslovakia, we should be at war with her. We had no treaty obligations and no legal obligations to Czechoslovakia and if we had said that, we feel that we should have received no support from the people of this country.
...When we were convinced, as we became convinced, that nothing any longer would keep the Sudetenland within the Czechoslovakian State, we urged the Czech Government as strongly as we could to agree to the cession of territory, and to agree promptly. The Czech Government, through the wisdom and courage of President Benes, accepted the advice of the French Government and ourselves. It was a hard decision for anyone who loved his country to take, but to accuse us of having by that advice betrayed the Czechoslovakian State is simply preposterous. What we did was to save her from annihilation and give her a chance of new life as a new State, which involves the loss of territory and fortifications, but may perhaps enable her to enjoy in the future and develop a national existence under a neutrality and security comparable to that which we see in Switzerland today. Therefore, I think the Government deserve the approval of this House for their conduct of affairs in this recent crisis which has saved Czechoslovakia from destruction and Europe from Armageddon.

Does the experience of the Great War and of the years that followed it give us reasonable hope that, if some new war started, that would end war any more than the last one did?

One good thing, at any rate, has come out of this emergency through which we have passed. It has thrown a vivid light upon our preparations for defence, on their strength and on their weakness. I should not think we were doing our duty if we had not already ordered that a prompt and thorough inquiry should be made to cover the whole of our preparations, military and civil, in order to see, in the light of what has happened during these hectic days, what further steps may be necessary to make good our deficiencies in the shortest possible time.

Questions:
1. After reading these documents, why do you think Chamberlain was praised by most British for his role in appeasing Hitler over the issue of the Sudetenland?
2. What was Chamberlain's justification for encouraging Czechoslovakia to accept Hitler's demands in the Munich Agreement? Was his position reasonable? Why or why not?
3. What positive results did Chamberlain see emerging from this crisis?
28.1 Nadezhda K. Krupskaya: *What a Communist Ought to Be Like*

Married to Lenin in 1898, Nadezhda K. Krupskaya (1869–1939) was an active revolutionary. Under Lenin’s government, she served on the People’s Commissariat of Education. In the excerpt included below, Krupskaya defined the characteristics of the true communist.


A communist is, first and foremost, a person involved in society, with strongly developed social instincts, who desires that all people should live well and be happy.

Communists can come from all classes of society, but most of all they are workers by birth. Why? Because the conditions of workers’ lives are such as to nurture in them social instincts: collective labor, the success of which depends on the separate efforts of each; the same conditions of labor; common experiences; the common struggle for humane conditions of existence. All this brings workers closer together and unites them with the bonds of class solidarity. Let us take the capitalist class. The conditions of life for this class are completely different. Competition forces each capitalist to see another capitalist primarily as an opponent, who has to be tripped up. In the worker the capitalist sees only “worker’s hands” which must labor for the creation of his, the capitalist’s, profits. Of course, the common struggle against the working class unites capitalists, but that internal unity, that formation into a collective which we see among workers—they have nothing to divide among themselves—does not exist in the capitalist class, where solidarity is corroded by competition. That is why in the working class the person with well-developed social instincts is the rule, while among the capitalists such a person is the exception.

Social instinct means a great many things. Often it offers a clue for finding a way out of a situation, for choosing the correct path. That is why during the purge of the RKP [Russian Communist Party], attention was paid to whether this or that member of the party had been born in a working family or not. He who comes from a worker’s background will more easily straighten himself out. The Russian intelligentsia, seeing how easily a worker, thanks to this class instinct, comprehends that which an intellectual, for example, perceives only with great difficulty, was inclined, in the end of the nineties and in the first half of the first decade of the twentieth century (1896–1903) to exaggerate the significance of class instinct. *Rabochaya Mysl’* [Workers’ Thought], one of the underground Social Democratic newspapers, even came to the conclusion that no one other than people from workingman backgrounds could be accepted as socialists. Since Marx and Engels were not workers, *Rabochaya Mysl’* wrote “We don’t need Marx and Engels!”

Class instinct, which among workers coincides with a social one, is a necessary condition for being a communist. Necessary, but not sufficient.

A communist must also know quite a lot. First, he must understand what is happening around him, and must gain an understanding of the existing system. When the workers’ movement began to develop in Russia, Social Democrats were concerned from the very first with the widespread distribution of such pamphlets as Dikshtein’s “Who Lives by What,” “Worker’s Day,” etc. But it is not enough to understand the mechanics of the capitalist system. The communist must also study the laws of the development of human society. He must know the history of the development of economic forms, of the development of property, of division into classes, of the development of state forms. He must understand their interdependence and know how religious and moral notions will develop out of a particular social structure. Understanding the laws of the development of human society, the communist must clearly picture to himself where social development is heading. Communism must be seen by him as not only a desired system, where the happiness of some will not be based on the misfortune of others; he must further understand that communism is that very system toward which mankind is moving, and that communists must clear a path to this system, and promote its speedy coming.

In workers’ circles at the dawn of the workers’ movement in Russia, commonly studied courses were, on the one hand, political economy, which had the aim of explaining the structure of contemporary society, and the history of culture (the history of culture was usually opposed to the regular exposition of history, which often presented just a set of heterogeneous historical data). That is why in the circles of those days they read the first volume of Marx’s *Capital* and F. Engels’ *The Origins of the Family, Property and State.*
In 1919, in one of the villages of Nizhny Novgorod province, in the village of Rabotki, I happened to come across this phenomenon. Teachers told me that in the intermediate school they taught political economy and the history of culture; that the students unanimously demanded the introduction of these subjects into the curriculum of the intermediate school.

Where could such a desire, and such a definitely formulated one, have come from among peasant youth in a Volga village whose population was occupied exclusively with Volga river trades and agriculture? Obviously, interest in political economy and the history of culture was brought into Rabotki by some worker, who at one time had attended some circle and who explained to the children what they needed to know.

However, at the present moment the Russian communist must know not only that. The October Revolution opened for Russia an opportunity for widespread building in the direction of communism. But in order to utilize these possibilities it is necessary to know what one can do at the moment in order to make at least one first step toward communism, and what one cannot, and it is necessary to know how to build a new life. It is necessary first and foremost to know thoroughly that sphere of work which you have undertaken, and then to master the method of a communist approach to the matter. Let us take an example. In order to organize correctly medical affairs in the country, it is first necessary to know the situation itself, secondly, how it was organized earlier in Russia and is currently organized in other states, and thirdly, how to approach the problem in a communist manner, namely, to conduct agitation among wide strata of workers, to interest them, to attract them to work, to create with their efforts a powerful organization in regard to medical affairs. It is necessary not only to know how to do all this, but to be able to do it. Thus it follows that a communist must know not only what communism is and why it is inevitable, but also know his own affairs well, and be able to approach the masses, influence them and convince them.

In his personal life, a communist must always conduct himself in the interests of communism. What does this mean? It means, for example, that however nice it might be to stay in a familiar, comfortable home environment, that if for the sake of the cause, for the success of the communist cause, it is necessary to abandon everything and expose oneself to danger, the communist will do this. It means that however difficult and responsible the task the communist is called upon to perform, he will take it upon himself and try to carry it out to the best of his strength and skill, whether it is at the front, during the confiscation of valuables, etc. It means that the communist puts his personal interests aside, subordinates them to the common interest. It means that the communist is not indifferent to what is happening around him and that he actively struggles with that which is harmful to the interests of the toiling masses, and that he on the other hand actively defends these interests and makes them his own.

Who was discarded during the purging of the party? (a) the self-seekers and their adherents, that is, those who put their personal interests above the communist cause; (b) those who were indifferent to communism, who did nothing to help it make headway, who stood far from the masses and made no efforts to draw closer to them; (c) those who did not enjoy the respect and love of the masses; (d) those who were distinguished by a coarse manner, conceit, insincerity and other such characteristics.

Thus, in order to be a communist: (1) it is necessary to know what is bad about the capitalist system, where social development is heading and how to promote the speediest coming of the communist system; (2) it is necessary to know how to apply one’s knowledge to the cause; and (3) it is necessary to be spiritually and physically devoted to the interests of the working masses and to communism.

**Question:**

1. What are some aspects of a communist’s personal life, according to Krupskaya?
28.2 Benito Mussolini: from *The Political and Social Doctrine of Fascism*

Benito Mussolini (1883–1945) was the founder of the Italian fascist movement. In 1922 Mussolini succeeded in intimidating King Victor Emmanuel III into handing power over to him and his followers. Fascist Italy and Germany cemented a formal alliance in 1939.


The years which preceded the March to Rome were years of great difficulty, during which the necessity for action did not permit of research or any complete elaboration of doctrine. The battle had to be fought in the towns and villages. There was much discussion, but—what was more important and more sacred—men died. They knew how to die. Doctrine, beautifully defined and carefully elucidated, with headlines and paragraphs might be lacking; but there was to take its place something more decisive—Faith. Even so, anyone who can recall the events of the time through the aid of books, articles, votes of congresses, and speeches of great and minor importance—anyone who knows how to research and weigh evidence—will find that the fundamentals of doctrine were cast during the years of conflict. It was precisely in those years that Fascist thought armed itself, was refined, and began the great task of organization. The problem of the relation between the individual citizen and the State; the allied problems of authority and liberty; political and social problems as well as those specifically national—a solution was being sought for all these while at the same time the struggle against Liberalism, Democracy, Socialism, and the Masonic bodies was being carried on, contemporaneously with the “punitive expedition.” But, since there was inevitably some lack of system, the adversaries of Fascism have disingenuously denied that it had any capacity to produce a doctrine of its own, though that doctrine was growing and taking shape under their very eyes, even though tumultuously; first, as happens to all ideas in their beginnings, in the aspect of a violent and dogmatic negation, and then in the aspect of positive construction which has found its realization in the laws and institutions of the regime as enacted successively in the years 1926, 1927 and 1928.

Fascism is now a completely individual thing, not only as a regime, but as a doctrine. And this means that today Fascism, exercising its critical sense upon itself and upon others, has formed its own distinct and peculiar point of view, to which it can refer and upon which, therefore, it can act in the face of all problems, practical or intellectual, which confront the world.

And above all, Fascism, the more it considers and observes the future and the development of humanity quite apart from political considerations of the moment, believes neither in the possibility nor the utility of perpetual peace. It thus repudiates the doctrine of Pacifism—born of a renunciation of the struggle and an act of cowardice in the face of sacrifice. War alone brings up to its highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it. All other trials are substitutes, which never really put men into the position where they have to make the great decision—the alternative of life or death. Thus a doctrine which is founded upon this harmful postulate of peace is hostile to Fascism. And thus hostile to the spirit of Fascism, though accepted for what use they can be in dealing with particular political situations, are all the international leagues and societies which, as history will show, can be scattered to the winds when once strong national feeling is aroused by any motive—sentimental, ideal, or practical. This anti-pacifist spirit is carried by Fascism even into the life of the individual: the proud motto of the Squadrista, “Me ne frego” (I do not fear), written on the bandage of the wound, is an act of philosophy not only stoic, the summary of a doctrine not only political—it is the education to combat, the acceptance of the risks which combat implies, and a new way of life for Italy. Thus the Fascist accepts life and loves it, knowing nothing of and despising suicide: he rather conceives of life as duty and struggle and conquest, life which should be high and full, lived for oneself, but above all for others—those who are at hand and those who are far distant, contemporaries, and those who will come after.

This “demographic” policy of the regime is the result of the above premise. Thus the Fascist loves in actual fact his neighbor, but this “neighbor” is not merely a vague and undefined concept, this love for one’s neighbor puts no obstacle in the way of necessary educational severity, and still less to differentiation of status and to physical distance. Fascism repudiates any universal embrace, and in order to live worthily in the community of civilized peoples watches its contemporaries with vigilant eyes, takes good note of their state of mind and, in the changing trend of their interests, does not allow itself to be deceived by temporary and fallacious appearances.

Such a conception of life makes Fascism the complete opposite of that doctrine, the base of the so-called scientific and Marxian Socialism, the materialist conception of history; according to which the history of human civilization can be explained simply through the conflict of interests among the various social groups and by the change and development in the means and instruments of production. That the changes in the economic field—new discoveries of raw materials, new methods of working them, and the inventions of science—have their importance no one can deny; but that these factors are
sufficient to explain the history of humanity excluding all others is an absurd delusion. Fascism, now and always, believes in holiness and in heroism; that is to say, in actions influenced by no economic motive, direct or indirect. And if the economic conceptions of history be denied, according to which theory men are no more than puppets, carried to and fro by the waves of chance, while the real directing forces are quite out of their control, it follows that the existence of an unchangeable and unchanging class war is also denied—the natural progeny of the economic conception of history. And above all Fascism denies that class war can be the preponderant force in the transformation of society. These two fundamental concepts of Socialism being thus refuted, nothing is left of it but the sentimental aspiration—as old as humanity itself—towards a social convention in which the sorrows and sufferings of the humblest shall be alleviated. But here again Fascism repudiates the conception of “economic” happiness, to be realized by Socialism and, as it were, at a given moment in economic evolution to assure to everyone the maximum of well-being. Fascism denies the materialist conception of happiness as a possibility, and abandons it to its inventors, the economists of the first half of the nineteenth century: that is to say, Fascism denies the validity of the equation, well-being = happiness, which would reduce men to the level of animals, caring for one thing only—to be fat and well-fed—and would thus degrade humanity to a purely physical existence.

After Socialism, Fascism combats the whole complex system of democratic ideology, and repudiates it, whether in its theoretical premises or in its practical application. Fascism denies that the majority, by the simple fact that it is a majority, can direct human society; it denies that numbers alone can govern by means of a periodical consultation, and it affirms the immutable, beneficial, and fruitful inequality of mankind, which can never be permanently leveled through the mere operation of a mechanical process such as universal suffrage. The democratic regime may be defined as from time to time giving the people the illusion of sovereignty, while the real effective sovereignty lies in the hands of other concealed and irresponsible forces. Democracy is a regime nominally without a king, but it is ruled by many kings—more absolute, tyrannical, and ruinous than one sole king, even though a tyrant. This explains why Fascism, having first in 1922 (for reasons of expediency) assumed an attitude tending towards republicanism, renounced this point of view before the March to Rome; being convinced that the question of political form is not today of prime importance, and after having studied the examples of monarchies and republics past and present reached the conclusion that monarchy or republicanism are not to be judged, as it were, by an absolute standard; but that they represent forms in which the evolution—political, historical, traditional, or psychological—of a particular country has expressed itself.

**Questions:**
1. How did Mussolini view democracy, socialism, and pacifism?
2. Why would Mussolini’s passionate embrace of heroism and violence appeal to so many Italians (and others) in the 1920s?
Part 28: Totalitarianism

28.3 Adolf Hitler: from Mein Kampf

A veteran of World War I, Adolf Hitler (1889–1945) blamed Germany’s defeat on Jews and Marxists. Hitler wrote Mein Kampf while in prison for his role in the 1923 “beer-hall putsche.” In the excerpt included here, Hitler discussed the nature and purpose of propaganda.


The basic racial elements are differently situated, not only territorially but also in individual cases within the same territory. Nordic men exist side by side with Eastern types; Easterners, with Dinarics; both of these types, with Westerners; and everywhere among them are mixed types. On the one hand this is a great disadvantage: The German folk lacks that sure instinct of the herd which has its roots in the unity of blood and, especially in moments when great danger threatens, preserves the nation from collapse, in as much as with such a folk all small internal distinctions will then immediately disappear and the common enemy will be faced with the closed front of the uniform herd. In the existence side by side of our most varied component racial elements, which have remained unmixed, lies the foundation of that which we designate with the word superindividualism. In peaceful times it may sometimes perform good services for us, but, considered all in all, it has deprived us of world supremacy. If the German folk, in its historical development, had possessed that herd-like unity which other peoples have enjoyed, the German Reich would today be mistress of the globe. World history would have taken another course, and no one can tell whether in this way that might not have been attained which so many deluded pacifists are hoping today to wheedle by moaning and whining: A peace supported not by the palm branches of tearful pacifistic female mourners but founded by the victorious sword of a master race (Herrenvolk) which places the world in the service of a higher culture. . . .

PROPAGANDA

In this regard one proceeded from the very correct principle that the size of the lie always involves a certain factor of credibility, since the great mass of a people will be more spoiled in the innermost depths of its heart, rather than consciously and deliberately bad. Consequently, in view of the primitive simplicity of its mind it is more readily captivated by a big lie than by a small one, since it itself often uses small lies but would be, nevertheless, too ashamed to make use of big lies. Such an untruth will not even occur to it, and it will not even believe that others are capable of the enormous insolence of the most vile distortions. Why, even when enlightened, it will still vacillate and be in doubt about the matter and will nevertheless accept as true at least some cause or other. Consequently, even from the most impudent lie something will always stick.

To whom must propaganda appeal? To the scientific mind or to the less educated masses?

The task of propaganda does not lie in a scientific education of the individual but in pointing out to the masses definite facts, processes, necessities, etc., the significance of which in this way is first to be brought within the masses’ range of vision.

The art lies exclusively therein, to do this in such an excellent way that a universal conviction arises of the reality of a fact, of the necessity of a process, of the correctness of something necessary, etc. Since it is not and cannot be necessary in itself, since its task, just as in the case of a placard, consists of bringing something before the attention of the crowd and not in the instruction of those who are scientifically trained or are seeking education and insight, its efficacy must always be oriented more to the emotions and only in a very restricted way to the so-called “intellect.”

All propaganda has to appeal to the people and its intellectual level has to be set in accordance with the receptive capacities of the most-limited persons among those to whom it intends to address itself. The larger the mass of men to be reached, the lower its purely intellectual level will have to be set. . . .

The art of propaganda lies precisely therein, that, comprehending the great masses’ world of emotions and imagination, it finds the way, in a psychologically correct form, to the attention and, further, to the hearts of the great masses.

The receptive capacity of the great masses is very restricted, its understanding small. On the other hand, however, its forgetfulness is great. On account of these facts all effective propaganda must restrict itself to very few points and impress these by slogans, until even the last person is able to bring to mind what is meant by such a word. . . .

In general the art of all truly great popular leaders at all times consists primarily in not scattering the attention of a people but rather in concentrating it always on one single opponent. The more unified this use of the fighting will of a people, the greater will be the magnetic attractive force of a movement and the more powerful the force of its push. It is a part of the genius of a great leader to make even quite different opponents appear as if they belonged only to one cate-
gory, because the recognition of different enemies leads weak and unsure persons only too readily to begin doubting their own cause.

When the vacillating masses see themselves fighting against too many enemies, objectivity at once sets in and raises the question whether really all the others are wrong and only one’s own people or one’s own movement is right.

Therewith, however, appears already the first weakening of one’s own force. Consequently, a number of intrinsically different opponents must always be comprehended together, so that in the view of the masses of one’s own adherents the fight is only being carried on against one enemy alone. This strengthens the faith in one’s own cause and increases the bitterness toward the aggressor against this cause.

In all cases in which there is a question of the fulfillment of apparently impossible demands or tasks, the entire attention of a people must be concentrated only on this one question, in such a way as if being, or non-being actually depends on its solution. Only in this way will one make a people willing and capable of really great accomplishments and exertions.

Questions:
1. What were Hitler’s views on the racial characteristics of Germans?
2. According to Hitler, what was the function of propaganda?
28.4 Christopher Dawson: Religion and the Totalitarian State

The British sociologist Christopher Dawson (1889–1970) focused his attention on the place of religion in the modern world. In the excerpt included here, Dawson described the relationship between religion and the totalitarian state as he saw it.


One of the most striking features of modern society is the increasing claims of the State on the individual. The sphere of action of the State has grown steadily larger until it now threatens to embrace the whole of human life and to leave nothing whatsoever outside its competence.

As I have written elsewhere, the modern state is daily extending its control over a wider area of social life and is taking over functions that were formerly regarded as the province of independent social units such as the family and the church, or as a sphere for the voluntary activities of private individuals. It is not merely that the state is becoming politicized. In the old days the statesman was responsible for the preservation of internal order and the defence of the state enemies. To-day he is called upon to deal more and more with questions of a purely sociological character and he may be expected to transform the whole structure of society and refashion the cultural traditions of the people. The abolition of war, the destruction of poverty, the control of the birth-rate, the elimination of unfit—these are questions which the statesman of the past would no more have dared to meddle with than the course of the season or the movements of the stars; yet they are all vital political issues today and some of them figure in the agenda of our political parties.

The most important step in this advance was undoubtedly the introduction of universal compulsory education for that put into the hands of the State the power and responsibility of forming the minds of the youth of the nation. But even before this the State on the Continent had made another advance that was almost as important, namely the institution of universal military service. The absence of this in the British Empire and America is one of the main dividing lines between the civilization of the Anglo-Saxon peoples and that of the rest of the world. It is a division which cuts across the division between East and West and between Fascist and Communist: for conscription is found equally in Russia and Italy, in Germany and Japan, in Turkey and Holland. And it is a distinction that rests at least to some extent on religious causes. For there can be no doubt that the attitude of the Free Churches, or some of them, would have made it very difficult for any British government to introduce permanent conscription in the nineteenth century, even if circumstances had demanded it.

Thirdly, we have the extension of economic control by the state, which is now perhaps the most important factor of all. It is due in part to Socialism, in part to the inherent needs of a highly organized industrial society, and in part to the humanitarian movement for social reform, which in this country, at least, is responsible for a great deal of modern social legislation.

It is interesting to note the diverse elements and personalities that have contributed to this result. In England we have the influence of an Evangelical individualist like Shaftesbury, alongside of the trade union movement, both currents finally merging in the Parliamentary social reform of the early twentieth century. In Germany we have the influence of the Social Democratic Party as well as the anti-socialist social legislation of Bismarck; and finally in Russia there is the anti-Christian communism of the Soviets and in Italy the anti-communist and anti-liberal corporativism of the Fascists.

I think it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the movement towards state control in every department of life is a universal one and is not to be confused with the political tenets of a party, whether Communist or Fascist. (The essential principle of the Totalitarian State was, in fact, asserted by Liberalism before Fascism was ever heard of.) What is happening to-day is that the movement towards state-control and state-organization has reached a point which it comes into conflict with the older forms of parliamentary democracy. The vast increase in the numbers of the electorate, the multiplication of political parties and the fundamental character of the points at issue all tend to produce a state of political deadlock which in turn leads parties to look to extra-parliamentary action in order to gain their ends. In practice this may mean general strikes, dictatorships, revolutions and every kind of violence. Nevertheless it rests fundamentally in a perfectly healthy and reasonable desire to put the state and the government of the state above party, and to ensure that the power which has so immense an influence for good or evil on the lives of every citizen shall not be at the mercy of a political clique or the servant of class interests. It is moreover difficult to deny that the old political ideal of individual liberty corresponded to the old ideals of economic individualism and laissez faire, and that the super session of the latter by state economic control and a planned economy involves some limitation of individual liberty in the political sphere and some increase in the authority of the government.

Now in fact we do find in every state, and not least in our own, such a limitation of freedom and increase of state authority taking place owing to the extension of bureaucratic government. In the Totalitarian State, however, we find in addition to this a new principle of political authority. This is not simply dictatorship. Indeed the pure type of dictatorship is to
be found rather in the Spain of Primo da Rivera than in either Russia or Germany. The new type of political authority is the dictatorship not of a man but of a party. But it is something very different from the political parties that we know in democratic countries. It is organized in an hierarchical fashion. That is to say, it is based on authority, discipline and subordination. It demands complete obedience and unlimited devotion from its members, who may have to undergo a period of probation before their admission and who may be degraded in rank, or expelled from the party altogether, if they show any signs of disloyalty or inefficiency. In short it resembles a religious or military order rather than a political party of the old type, and it tends to foster the same strong esprit de corps as they do.

There is no doubt that the type of political organization has shown its effectiveness both in the Communist and Fascist States. It is in fact the one element in the Totalitarian State that is an undisputed success.\(^1\) It combines the aristocratic principle of government by a privileged elite with a democratic width in the basis of selection. But at the same time it can be a most formidable instrument of tyranny, for the very strength of its corporate spirit is apt to generate intolerance and fanaticism. Yet on the other hand it may be argued that a Totalitarian State without this element would be a soulless bureaucracy which would leave no room for any free initiative and would reduce the whole society to a dead level of mechanical uniformity.

What then is the position of the religious man and the religious society under these new political circumstances? How far does this new political development threaten the spiritual liberty which is essential to religion? Ought the Church to condemn the Totalitarian State in itself and prepare itself for resistance to the secular power and for persecution? Should the Church ally itself with the political and social forces that are hostile to the new state? Or should it limit its resistance to cases of state interference in ecclesiastical matters or in theological questions? Or finally are the new forms of authority and political organization reconcilable in principle with Christian ideas and are the issues that divide Church and State accidental and temporary ones which are extraneous to the essential nature of the new political development? It is impossible to answer these questions offhand and in the lump. We must first clear the ground by a closer definition of the issues and by making a number of necessary distinctions.

1. In the first place we must distinguish between spiritual freedom and political and economic liberty. It is one of the great classical commonplaces of religion and of ancient philosophy that the two are not the same: that a man may possess citizenship and wealth and yet be without spiritual freedom and that a man may be poor and a slave, like Epictetus and yet enjoy the good of spiritual freedom. To-day there are many who would question this. But whether it be true or no there can be no question that the two kinds of freedom are distinct and that they do not always co-exist with one another.

Now the great age of liberalism and individualism was not in fact approved by the religious conscience of the age. On the Continent the advance of political liberty was accompanied almost everywhere by an anti-religious movement which did much to secularize European civilization. And at the same time, the economic individualism of the Liberal economists was condemned as being inconsistent with Christian morals by religious leaders such as Leo XIII and Bishop von Ketteler of Mainz.

In England Liberalism on the whole had not this irreligious character. Nevertheless it was far from meeting with the unrestricted approval of religious men. The Oxford Movement, for instance, was definitely opposed to political liberalism, while F. D. Maurice, the leading social thinker in the Church of England, was as outspoken in his condemnation of democracy as in his opposition to economic individualism. In these respects he was the disciple of Coleridge and Carlyle, and though the latter cannot perhaps be regarded as a Christian thinker he certainly exercised a very strong influence on religious thought in nineteenth century England.

I think we may conclude that there is no essential connection between Christianity on the one hand and the parliamentary democracy and economic liberalism of the nineteenth century on the other. Undoubtedly a fusion between the two did take place in the later nineteenth century in England, the age of Gladstonian liberalism, but this was a local and temporary phenomenon which has little bearing on the fundamental character of the forces involved.

Consequently there is no fundamental reason why the passing of parliamentary democracy and economic individualism should be opposed to Christian principles or sentiment. It is at least theoretically possible that the limitation of political and economic freedom by the extension of social control should be actually favourable to the cause of spiritual freedom. In practice, however, we have got to consider the spiritual tendency of the new political forces, before we can decide whether their influence is favourable or hostile to Christianity.

\(^1\) Since this was written events in Germany have shown the existence of a serious conflict between the principle of State authority and that of Party Dictatorship. The Reichswehr is not like the Red Army, the passive instrument of the dominant party, it is a quasi-independent power which recognizes the Nazi Party only in so far as the party recognizes the paramount authority of the State. Thus there is a certain dualism in the present régime in Germany, which has been resolved, in so far as it has been resolved by the subordination of the Party to the State rather than vice versa.
2. Here we must distinguish between the various forms of the totalitarian State. It is obvious that the totalitarian State is not a uniform phenomenon. There is obviously not only a difference but an opposition between the Fascist and Communist types. While within Fascism there is a considerable difference in the character and principles of the Fascist regime in its Italian and German forms.

Now in the case of Communism, there is an obvious and apparently irreducible opposition between Communism and Christianity. The Soviet state has gone further to eliminate religion from society than any state that has ever existed. And no doubt it is the spectacle of this vast system of organized secularism that has alarmed Christian opinion more than anything else. We feel that the modern Totalitarian State has a power of control over the lives and thoughts of its members which no ancient state ever possessed and consequently we are doubtful of the power of Christianity to face this new power as it faced its persecutors in the past.

Nevertheless Communism is not simply a form of political organization; it is an economy, a philosophy and a creed. And its hostility to Christianity is due not to its political form, but to the philosophy that lies behind it. Communism, in fact, challenges Christianity on its own ground by offering mankind a *rival way of salvation*. In the words of a Communist poster: ‘Jesus promised the people Paradise after death, but Lenin offers them Paradise on earth’. Consequently the opposition of Communism to Christianity rests not on the Totalitarian character of the Communist state, but on the religious exclusivism of the Communist philosophy, and though these phenomena are not unrelated they are by no means identical. After all, Marx himself was no believer in the Totalitarian State. He believed that Communism involved the ‘withering away’ of the state and the complete supersession of all forms of political authority. Yet his state-less society, if it could be realized, would be even more anti-religious than the most secularized type of Totalitarian State. It would be, so to speak, the Church of the Godless Tri-

umphant, whereas the Communist state under the Proletarian Dictatorship is only the Godless Church Militant.

Hence if we wish to study the Totalitarian State in its essential character, we shall do better to look to Fascism rather than to Communism, for it was, after all, the Fascists who first coined the expression, and with them the new state stands on its own rights and its own principles and is not merely, as with the Communists, the vehicle of a philosophy and a temporary instrument for the carrying out of an economic revolution.

Now the Fascist State is not consciously or intentionally hostile to religion. In Italy and Austria it has given a much fuller recognition to the place of religion in national life than did the democratic regime that it replaced. In Italy the attitude of the Fascist State is objective and realistic. It takes account of the Church as a living element in the national being, as a cultural and social asset which must be incorporated in the new system. Moreover Mussolini, at least, has increasingly recognized the ethical bases of the state and of political authority, a conception on which the traditional concordance or alliance of the temporal and spiritual powers has always been based.

In Germany however the situation is different. There is a strong strain of radical and political mysticism in National Socialism which involves a serious danger of conflict between Church and State. It is not that the Nazi movement is anti-religious. The danger is rather that it has a religion of its own which is not that of Christian orthodoxy. This religion has not the dogmatic character of the Communist creed, it is a fluid and incoherent thing which expresses itself in several different forms. There is the neo-paganism of the extreme Pan-German element, there is the Aryanized and nationalized Christianity of the German Christians, and there is the racial and nationalist idealism which is characteristic of the movement as a whole, and which, if not religious in the strict sense, tends to develop a mythology and ethic of its own that may easily take the place of Christian theology and Christian ethics.

At the same time it would be a mistake to suppose that National Socialism is generally regarded in Germany as hostile to Christianity. The coming of the new regime means the abandonment of the religious neutrality or indifferentism of the liberal state, and this cannot but meet with the approval of those who still accept the traditional Lutheran ideal of the relations of Church and State. German Protestants, or at least Lutherans, cannot but sympathize with the ideal of a National Church which would be organically related to the new national state and would restore the spiritual unity of the German people. There are however grave objections even to this ideal. For in the first place, such a union could only embrace the Protestant part of the nation, and consequently it would only accentuate the religious divisions of Germany and would thus increase rather than diminish the danger of religious strife. Moreover, in the second place, the relation of the State to the National Church would be fundamentally different from that which existed in earlier centuries. In the past the Church and State were bound together, because the people was consciously Christian. The same individuals were members of both societies, and even when the prince asserted his supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, he did so as a member of the Church who accepted its moral and theological teachings.

But this state of things no longer exists in the world today. In Protestant Germany, above all, only a small part of the population consists of practising Christians and there is no reason to suppose that the rulers of the state should be more Christian than the rest of the nation. If the National Socialists create a national church and give it a privileged position, it will not be because they believe that the Christian faith is necessary for salvation, but because they think that such a church would be a valuable support to them in their work of national reorganization and education. In other words, the national church will be the servant of the national state and the organ of its moral and social propaganda.
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Now it is easy for us to condemn such a development because we as Englishmen have no political sympathy with the Nazi propaganda or with the German type of Totalitarian State. But what would our attitude be towards a similar development which had a different political movement and a different set of ideas behind it? We may not have a Totalitarian State in this country of the same kind that we find in Germany or in Italy. Nevertheless, as I have already pointed out, the same forces that make for governmental control and social uniformity are at work here also and in the U.S.A., and it seems to me highly probable that these forces will result in the formation of a type of Totalitarian State which bears the same relation to Anglo-Saxon political and social traditions, as the Nazi State bears to the traditions of Prussia and Central Europe. Such a state might be nominally Socialist, but it would not be the Socialism of the Third International; it might be Nationalist, but it would not be the militant racial nationalism of the Nazis. Its ideals would probably be humanitarian, democratic and pacific. Nevertheless it will make the same universal claims as the Totalitarian State in Russia and Germany and it will be equally unwilling to tolerate any division of spiritual allegiance.

What attitude will such a state adopt towards Christianity and the Christian Churches? I do not believe that it will be anti-Christian in the Russian sense, or that it will be inspired by any conscious hostility to religion. On the other hand, it will have very little in common with the old liberal state which claimed to be no more than a policeman and left men free to guide their lives by whatever religious or moral standard they chose to adopt. The new state will be universal and omnicompetent. It will mold the mind and guide the life of its citizens from the cradle to the grave. It will not tolerate any interference with its educational functions by any sectarian organization, even though the latter is based on religious convictions. And this is the more serious, since the introduction of psychology into education has made the schoolmaster a spiritual guide as well as a trainer of the mind. In fact it seems as though the school of the future must increasingly usurp the functions that the Church exercised in the past, and that the teaching profession will take the place of the clergy as the spiritual power of the future.

Nor will the state confine its educational activities to the training of the young. It will more and more tend to control public opinion in general by its organs of instruction and propaganda in this country. We have already secured the nationalization and public control of Broadcasting, and I believe the time is not far distant when similar methods will be applied to the control of the Press, and the Cinema. It is obvious that a Totalitarian State, whether of the Fascist or the democratic type, cannot afford to leave so great a power of influencing public opinion in private hands, and the fact that the control of the popular Press and of the film industry is often in unworthy hands gives the state a legitimate excuse to intervene. The whole tendency of modern civilization is, in fact, to concentrate the control of opinion in a few hands. For example, Hollywood to-day forms the taste and influences the thought of millions all over the world. As our civilization becomes more completely mechanized, it becomes easier to control, and the organs of control become more centralized. It is true that these things are not usually regarded as having much relevance to the religious issue. But we may ask ourselves—do people go to the cinema or to church? Does not the cinema take the place that was formerly occupied by church and chapel? Has not Hollywood got a distinct ethic of its own which influences the minds of its audiences? Is this ethic in any sense Christian?

Now the centralized control which will be characteristic of the new state will doubtless stand on a higher moral level than that of Hollywood, but there is no reason to suppose that it will be Christian in any real sense. Its moral standards will no doubt be higher than the commercialized morality of the press and cinema, but they will be essentially secular standards and consequently more akin to the latter than to the traditional Christian ethics of the Church. But whether these standards are high or low, whether they represent the bourgeois idealism of the Rotarians, or the racial idealism of the Nazis or the proletarian idealism of the Communists, they will be the only standards recognized and tolerated. They will govern the whole of life. It will be impossible to go one’s own way, as in the old days, and leave the state in control of politics. For there will be no department of life in which the state will not intervene and which will not be obliged to conform to the mechanized order of the new society.

This is the situation that Christians have got to face. The great danger that we have to meet is not the danger of violent persecution but rather that of the crushing out of religion from modern life by the sheer weight of a state-inspired public opinion and by the mass organization of society on a purely secular basis. Such a state of things has never occurred before because the state has never been powerful enough to control every side of social life. It has been a state with limited functions, not a Totalitarian State. Moreover, in the past, public opinion recognized the validity of the religious category and the autonomy of the religious life, even when it opposed and persecuted particular forms of religion. To-day the conflict is a deeper and a wider one. It goes to the very roots of life and affects every aspect of human thought and action. One might even say that the very existence of religion itself is at stake, were it not that there are some who hold that religion is no longer to be identified with Christianity and the other historic religions but is finding a new social expression in the movements that are creating the new state: Communism, National Socialism and Liberal Humanitarianism. If this is the case, we must alter our terminology and say, as Professor Julian Huxley said the other day, that the coming conflict is not one between religion and secular civilization but rather ‘between the God-religious and the social-religious’—in other words between the worship of God and the cult of the state or of the race or of humanity. I do not myself believe that man
will ever find a true religious satisfaction in the worship of himself, or even of some magnified and idealized reflection of himself in the race or in humanity at large. Nevertheless it is impossible to deny that Russian Communism, for example, resembles a religion in many respects. Its attitude of a believer to the gospel of salvation; Lenin is more than a political hero, he is the canonized saint of Communism with a highly developed cultus of his own; and the Communist ethic is religious in its absoluteness and its unlimited claims to the spiritual allegiance of its followers. This, however, is an extreme case. Outside Russia I do not think we are likely to find a state religion of so exclusive and uncompromising a kind. Everywhere, however, the new state will make for spiritual uniformity, and this uniformity will not be based on Christian principles and will hardly admit of the continued existence of autonomous spiritual societies.

Now it is clear that we cannot meet this development on its own ground—the ground of politics. We cannot demand that the state should return to nineteenth century principles of non-intervention and individual liberty, because these conditions are favourable to the free development of the Christian churches or sects. Still less can we hope to see the creation of a definitely Christian social and political order, such as a truly Christian people might achieve. We cannot expect the world to accept Christian political or economic principles when it does not accept the Christian faith or Christian moral principles. We must recognize our material weakness before we can realize the sources of our spiritual strength. As I have said elsewhere, there has seldom been a time when the People of God seemed weaker and more scattered and more at the mercy of its enemies than it seems today. As Karl Barth has said in his remarkable reply to the German Christians, this is not a time for political or ecclesiastical-political movements, but for the creation of a spiritual center of resistance, a return to the real sources of spiritual vitality. It is important for us to remember that the religious solution of the spiritual problems of an age does not arise out of the political situation; it arises out of the religious situation as a religious answer to a religious need. Consequently it often arises from some quarter which the publicists and the leaders of public opinion entirely ignore.

The ancient world in the first century B.C. was in dire need of a religious solution, and the wise men of the age provided one in the religious revival of the Augustan age. But since their solution arose directly from the political situation, it provided merely a political remedy. The true solution came from an entirely unsuspected quarter—from an unknown sect and a despised people. But it arose directly out of the religious situation: it was not an answer to the political needs of the Roman world, but the fulfilment of the hope of Israel. The same principle holds good in every age. Nothing could have been more discouraging than the religious situation in England in the early part of the eighteenth century. It was threatened by the rationalism of the Deists, by the secularism of the Whig state and by popular materialism and the brutalization of the masses. The wise men attempted to find their solution in a rational Christianity purged of enthusiasm which would be indispensable to the state as a bulwark of law and order and morality. Then there arose a prophet in Israel, John Wesley, and the whole situation was altered. The solution of Hoadley and Warburton did not ever gain the respect of those whom it was intended to conciliate, while the solution of Wesley transformed the whole spiritual climate of eighteenth century England. Of course this was not simply the result of Wesley’s personal genius. It meant that English religion possessed spiritual resources which the intellectual and ecclesiastical leaders of the age had not discovered and Wesley was the man who released these reserves of spiritual energy.

The essential duty of the Church towards the State and the world is to bear witness to the truth that is in her. If the light is hidden, we cannot blame the world outside for ignoring it. It is of course possible that men may know Christianity and still reject it, but in the great majority of cases the men who follow the new secularist ideals of life and regard Christianity as discredited are men who have never known it as a living reality, but have been acquainted with it only at second-hand or in distorted forms. Here sectarianism has much to answer for. We can see, for example, from Edmund Gosse’s story of his early life how a really sincere and pious Christian can make religion hateful to those he knows best owing to the narrow and unlovely forms with which he identifies it.

Nevertheless sectarianism is by no means solely responsible for the failure of religion in the modern world. An even more widely spread cause is the indifference and apathy which spring from a mechanical and lifeless acceptance of religion as a matter of course. When the practice of religion becomes a matter of social conformity, it is powerless to change the world. Indeed the men who are religious because society expects them to be, will be irreligious for the same reason in a secular society. It is impossible to deny that there has been an immense amount of this social conformity in English religion and the drastic secularization of state and culture will not have been an unmixed evil if it produces in reaction a thorough desecularization of the church and of religion.

It is very noticeable that this process of secularization is most violent in the countries such as Russia where the Church has been most closely associated with the state and where social conformity played the largest part in religion. Of course there are fundamental differences between the type of social conformity that was typical of Russian religion and that which is characteristic of England. The former was conspicuously non-ethical, whereas the latter usually takes the form of an identification of Christianity with social ethics. Nevertheless each of these types is equally compromised by the new situation; neither of them can survive in the atmosphere of the new state. The ethical idealism which was characteristic of nineteenth century culture is passing away with the culture that gave it birth. As Karl Barth has written: “All that was called
Liberty, Justice, Spirit, only a year ago and for a hundred years farther back, where has it all gone? Now these are all temporal, material, earthly goods. All flesh is as grass. . . . 'It is harder for us to realize this here in England than for Christians in Germany, just as it was easier for the Russians to realize it than for the Germans. The sun sets later in the West, but it must set at last. The state is steadily annexing all that territory that was formerly the domain of individual freedom; it has already taken more than anyone would have conceived possible a century ago. It has taken economics, it has taken science, it has taken ethics. But there is one thing it can never take, because to quote Karl Barth once more, ‘Theology and the Church are the natural frontiers of everything—even of the Totalitarian State.’ Only it is necessary that Christians should themselves recognize this frontier: that they should remember that it is not the business of the Church to do the same thing as the State—to build a Kingdom like the other kingdoms of men, only better; nor to create a reign of earthly peace and justice. The Church exists to be the light of the world, and if it fulfils its function, the world is transformed in spite of all the obstacles that human powers place in the way. A secularist culture can only exist, so to speak, in the dark. It is a prison in which the human spirit confines itself when it is shut out of the wider world of reality. But as soon as the light comes, all the elaborate mechanism that has been constructed for living in the dark becomes useless. The recovery of spiritual vision gives man back his spiritual freedom. And hence the freedom of the Church is in the faith of the Church and the freedom of man is in the knowledge of God.

**Question:**

1. How can religion “restrain” the totalitarian power?
28.5 The Russian Revolution

With the Russian Revolution of 1917 came the attempt to implement socialist policies throughout the newly created Soviet Union. How people experienced the Revolution depended in part on their attitude and on their status before the war. Below are three excerpts from interviews from the 1990s (after the collapse of the U.S.S.R.—see Chapter 29) with women who lived through the Revolution.

28.5a Embracing the Revolution

Sofia Nikandrovna Pavlova grew up in Siberia with her grandfather, a railroad worker (a proletarian). She worked for 23 years in the International Division of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union (CPSU) and was involved in other elite soviet organizations. In the 1990s, she lived with her younger son, a retired chemist, in a modestly furnished apartment reserved for the elites of the Soviet Union.


And after the Revolution did life change?

Yes, first of all, a Bolshevik organization immediately came to light at the Taiga engine house. And it turned out that my uncles, who worked and lived in Taiga, were all underground Bolsheviks. And it was my Uncle Shura who kept urging me, Join, join the party. And I would say, But I’m not ready, I can’t. Just how old was I then? In 1917 I was almost fourteen years old. And he would say, Join, join. They were accepting young people. But we quickly organized a Komsomol organization with their help, and I worked, I immediately began working in this Komsomol organization. I was in charge of mobilizing the ranks of young people for a certain length of time. Then I was an instructor for work among girls, and I rode around the district on horseback. Then I was the editor of the district Komsomol newspaper, where I wrote my own poetry, or rather published my own poetry. Yes. So I immediately took an active part, and it was thanks to Uncle Shura’s influence. At first, it was imperceptible; he didn’t propagandize. As I said, I loved Uncle Shura very much, and he too loved us very much—especially me, he loved and spoiled me. Whenever he came back from a business trip, in the beginning, when he worked as a railroad engineer’s assistant, he would say, Come here, look what I have in my pocket for you. I would run, knowing that I would find some kind of yummy candy.

Sofia Nikandrovna, what do you think it was that attracted you to this revolutionary work?

Well, I think that going to these meetings and taking part in these mass demonstrations on the square in front of the train station, of course, had an enormous influence on me. And then, undoubtedly, Uncle Shura also had some kind of influence. He was very well read, and, you see, at one time he had been secretary of this underground organization, before the revolution. Yes. Undoubtedly... I don’t remember that he propagandized me. I only remember that later he would say to me, Join the party, join the party.... No, I’m not ready, I’m not ready.

And why did you think that you were not ready?

For some reason I thought that I wasn’t ready. But I worked very actively, very actively. I was a member of ChON. I had a Mauser, and we would go out to hunt down [rebel] bands—there were lots of them. Remnants of Kolchak’s soldiers.
ChON—What Does That Stand For?

Units on special assignment.11 Yes. We fought these bands. Right after the revolution. This was largely in 1920, the beginning of 1920. Yes. But then all the same I joined the party. In 1921, I was accepted as a candidate for party membership. And immediately—today this isn’t of interest to anyone, nobody needs this—immediately they made me secretary of the organization, the party organization, me, a candidate for party membership! Only at that time and only in Taiga could that have happened.12 The organization included all party members: those who belonged to the party’s regional committee, to the Komsomol’s regional committee, to the police, and to the court. Party members of all these bodies formed a single cell. That’s what they called it. I was secretary of this cell. Then, in 1921, actually at the beginning of 1922, we had a chistka,13 or party cleansing. Here in Moscow it occurred earlier, in 1921, but ours took place at the beginning of 1922. And at the time of the purge, the party members met and decided that I should be promoted to full membership in the party. And they accepted me. So I’ve been a full member of the party since June 1922. Yes. Mainly I worked in the raikom of the Komsomol, and at the same time I was secretary of the party organization. How I combined the two, I don’t know.

And Was the Party Organization Large?

Yes, it was quite large, because I would say there were approximately 100 people in the party raikom, something like that. It was large.

And Were There Many Women?

Women? No, there weren’t many women.

You Were One of Only a Few Women and Yet They Advanced You?

I don’t even know. An instructor in the party raikom vouched for me. When I joined the party, he said that I was completely worthy of it. Yes. In addition to everything else, in addition to working in the Komsomol raikom and in the party raikom I would walk seven kilometers with my friend Roma Kvopinskaia. She was Polish. Her father had been exiled to Siberia, or rather her grandfather, in 1861, after the Polish uprising.14 Yes. And his children had remained there. And so Roma Kvopinskaia and I became close friends. And we would walk seven kilometers out of Taiga, along the railroad tracks, surrounded by forest on both sides, in order to teach adults to read and write. And here’s how they paid us. One person would bring a mug of milk, another a piece of bread. That’s what we lived on. We would do this on our days off. Most likely, on Sundays—I don’t remember any more—but every week, without fail, we would go to this way station. Then they would have “dried bread week.” They would collect pieces of dried bread for famine victims on the Volga.15 This was already at the beginning of 1922.

Sofia Nikandrovna, You Said You Went Out and Carried on Propaganda Work Among the Girls, Right?

Oh, it’s terrifying to think about it, because several times... There were many kulaks there. Siberians, you know, were really very prosperous. And there were the so-called zaimki16 or settlements. And that’s precisely where the prosperous ones lived. They kept livestock, bees, and so forth; they traveled around and traded, and so forth. Yes. It makes my skin crawl when I think about it. Sometimes we would be awakened in the middle of the night. I didn’t travel alone; I would travel with one of the Komsomol raikom secretaries. He would be on one horse, and I would be on another. And they would wake us up at night: “Hurry, saddle your horses and get out of here. Get away, get away, they’re coming to kill you.” Yes. More than once we were warned like this. But even so, we would ride out again, again carry on our agitation

11 ChON is the acronym for Extraordinary Units on Special Assignment. These were military formations composed of party members, Komsomol members, and sympathizers. Mobilized to fight in the civil war, they were supposed to be crack units. They operated outside of regular Red Army channels and in close cooperation with the Cheka, the secret police.

12 She is explaining why it was that she was elevated to such an important position as secretary, when she had not yet been accepted as a full member of the Communist party.

13 In March 1921, the Communist party tightened its recruitment policy and began to expel (or purge) members who for various reasons (“passivity,” careerism, drunkenness) were considered unworthy of membership. About one-fifth of party members had been expelled by the start of 1922.

14 Late in the eighteenth century, Poland lost its independence and was incorporated into the Russian empire. Polish patriots greatly resented this subjection, and in 1860–1861, they staged patriotic demonstrations that led to clashes with the police and culminated in an unsuccessful rebellion against Russian rule, which was not suppressed until 1864.

15 In 1921–1922, a terrible famine broke out along the Volga river, threatening the lives of millions of peasants. It was caused by civil war depredations and the Bolshevik policy of forcibly requisitioning grain from the peasantry. It had already become the practice to mobilize people for a specific period and purpose. In the case of “dried bread week,” people were mobilized to collect food for victims of famine.

16 Separate farmsteads, at some distance from one another, were characteristic of Siberia, where the peasant commune was not so widespread as in the rest of Russia.
work. We wanted to create a Komsomol organization, we wanted to involve the girls, because this was the hardest thing to do. The Siberian girls were rather resistant to such agitation. And already I considered myself an agitator and propagandist. Yes, I did.

How Did You Attract Them? What Did You Say to Them, Do You Remember?

No. I don’t remember very well. I agitated for Soviet power, I said that it was good power, that it had given us freedom. “See, we can assemble, and could you assemble in tsarist times? Could you speak out, as I am speaking out right now?” I remember once I even said that. Although later one of the Komsomol secretaries said to me: “Why do you say things like that. You shouldn’t. You shouldn’t speak like that.”

And What Was it He Didn’t Like?

I don’t know what it was, but at any rate he didn’t like it. And here the Siberian, or rather the Taiga period of my life draws to a close. At the end of 1922 the Komsomol raikom sent me and my friend Roma Kvopinskaia to Tomsk to study at the rabochii fakultet, the rabfak. We set off for Tomsk and enrolled. I don’t remember whether we took any entrance exams or not. Most likely there weren’t any exams; they simply accepted us. They made sure we could read and write, but of course we were literate because the elementary school provided a very good education, a very good education.

**Question:**
1. What do you learn from these excerpts about the affects of the Revolution on people's lives?
Part 28: Totalitarianism

28.5b  A Peasant’s View of the Revolution

Irina Ivanova Kniazeva was a peasant woman who remained a peasant woman throughout her life. While the Revolution greatly affected her and her family’s well-being, she seemed to be little touched by Soviet ideology. Her family were branded kulaks (wealthy peasants); she reluctantly joined the commune or collective farm. In the commune, she barely had enough to live on, resorting to stealing grain by hiding it in her pockets. One child died of starvation. In retirement, she received a monthly pension of 12 rubles (pensions were first established for collective workers in the 1960s; 12 rubles was the minimum, 50 rubles was the average).


Irina Ivanovna, You Said That You Still Remember What Life Was Like Before the Revolution and That You Remember the Revolution Itself.

Yes, yes.

Talk About it, Please.

You mean, how people welcomed Lenin?

Yes.

Well, when freedom was declared, everyone went to church, the people gathered in the church, and we dragged out all the icons. Our village was good. The streets were straight and even; the houses were good. So we marched around the village with these icons and the Gospels. My grandfather welcomed the revolution with the Gospels, too, but he was the first to be branded a kulak and dispossessed. So we welcomed Lenin by walking around the village with these icons, with prayers. Free at last, free at last. We went round the entire village, and then we put the icons back in the church.

When Was This? So They Rejoiced that the Revolution had Taken Place?

Yes. This was when the revolution was over, when Lenin was already there.*

And How Did Your Family Respond to the Revolution? Did They React to it Positively? After all, There was the Civil War. And then Some Sided with the Whites, Some with the Reds.

Well, the Whites came, then the Reds. Day and night they came. We had a house. Of course, it only had one room, but it was big. So they would come for the night. The yard was large. It could hold lots of carts. The Whites would pass through, and then the Reds would come: “Have the Whites been here?” “They’ve come and gone.” The Reds would pass through, and then the Whites would come: “Have the Reds been here?” “They’ve come and gone.” Many times they spent the night at our place. An iron stove was kept lit, and one soldier boy—I remember it as if it were today, I wasn’t asleep—one soldier boy sat near the stove and said: “Lice, lice, lice.” Grandma said to him: “Sonny.” He was young, he was handsome, and he was Russian. “Granny,” he said, “the lice are eating me up.” And so they came, oh, they came day and night. I don’t know how many.

And Your Family—Were They Closer to the Reds or to the Whites, or to Neither?

Neither to one nor the other. Whatever happens, happens. Here’s how I understood it: Whoever wins, wins. The Whites would come, they would go into the granary to see what was there—oats—and they would take it. Then the Reds would come, and the same thing would happen: “Do you have any oats? We need to feed our horses.” “Shucks, no, the Whites have already been here and cleaned us out.” “Well, we’ll get our hands on what’s there. Come on, open the granary.” And that’s what happened. Life was very hard. So, what else can I tell you?
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**How Did you Suffer?**

Well, we were all branded kulaks and dispossessed.

**Can You Talk About It?**

Of course. This I remember very well. First of all, we were deprived of the right to vote.

**When Was That?**

That was 1928. They took away our vote because we had this shop and engaged in trade. That was the main reason. They took away my father’s right to vote, my mother’s right to vote, and my sister’s (she was eighteen at the time). But we didn’t know what that meant. So they began to explain: You won’t be admitted to meetings, you won’t be able to vote on anything. Well, okay, was that really so bad? That didn’t seem bad at all. But then in 1929, forced requisitioning of grain began, and they started imposing taxes in kind, procurement quotas, and who did they impose them on? On lishentsy,* of course—that is, on those deprived of the right to vote. And we weren’t the only ones affected. Other families, who were even more prosperous, were affected too. The first quota we met, the second quota we met, and the third; but the fourth time we didn’t deliver the grain, and so my father was put in prison for not meeting...

**For Not Meeting the Quota?**

Yes, that’s right. Father went to prison, and seven of us were left, Mother was left alone. You can well imagine the trauma we suffered. All our lives we had been protected by such a strong father and suddenly to be deprived of him. Of course, we shed tears. Everything happened at once. Not only did they put Father in prison, but they began confiscating our livestock because we had failed to meet the quota. Then after about six months, Father was released from prison. He came home and everyone rejoiced, thinking that that was the end of it. Nothing could have been farther from the truth. A short time later, procurement quotas were again imposed, again those taxes in kind. And again they put Father in prison, and they literally took everything away from us. They wanted to deport us—a mother and her children—to Solovki [short for Solovetskie ostrova, islands in the far north that were a place of exile, internment, and forced labor]. But then I guess some chairman must have taken pity on us, because, after all, we were his people. Now the poor peasants, or *bednota*, immediately went after our possessions. They were filled with such hatred: “Why should they have lived so well?”

**Question:**

1. How do these excerpts expand your understanding of the Revolution?
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28.5c Suffering under the Revolution

Anna Akimovna Dubova was part of a patriarchal peasant family of Old Believers, a sect persecuted by the tsars, which informs her grandmother’s comments about Lenin. Her family actually avoided exile only by promising Anna in marriage to the local communist party secretary—a fact she hid in the excerpt below. She did not in the end marry this person, and in order to leave the village she had to sign papers renouncing her family. She claimed she would have preferred her religious, peasant life to the industrial, urban life she actually lived.


Anna Akimovna, Do You Remember the 1920s? I Realize You Were Small Then.

Yes, of course I do. I remember the famine of 1922. I remember we had a very good horse and sold her for one hundred poods of salt. And I remember my father brought home three sacks of millet, and that millet had already gone bad, understand?

Why Did You Need so Much Salt?

Because we used salt as a preservative. There was absolutely nothing available, and so we had to preserve meat, we had to preserve cabbage. We simply had to have supplies in reserve or else we would have died of hunger. At that time there was a typhus epidemic. And our father even went into the woods and broke off juniper branches. And he kept fresh juniper tacked up everywhere in the house, and he was constantly replenishing it. Consequently, none of us got typhus. That’s how he saved the family. Many people died from typhus. Then, in 1922, they made Father chairman of the village soviet because he was better educated than any others.

And What’s Your Feeling, Do You Think Your Father Accepted the Revolution?

You know, I’m not absolutely sure, but it seems to me that he wasn’t happy about the revolution.

Even Though They Made Him Chairman of the Village Soviet?

No, that didn’t make any difference. Somehow he could see down the road, and he sensed that something would... And my grandmother—you know how villagers used to say that a new tsar had come to power and that he was the Antichrist. People said that—that the forces of the Antichrist had come to power. I remember it very well.

You Mean, They Said That About the Bolsheviks?

Yes, Grandmother said that. She was uneducated, she lived in the backwoods, and yet she knew that the forces of the Antichrist had come to power. I remember that very well. She said: “We have a new tsar; the forces of the Antichrist have triumphed.” That was when Lenin came to power.

And Do You Remember When Lenin Died?

When Lenin died? Yes, I remember that too. Then people said, The new tsar has died. The new tsar has died, they said, but the power of the Antichrist persists. That’s what they said, The power of the Antichrist persists.

Was Your Village Quite Prosperous?

Our village wasn’t poor. People lived reasonably well; they were able to provide for themselves. And that’s the way it was until NEP. And then during NEP, everyone began to live very well—or at least the majority did. A great many people became prosperous. There was a lot of building going on. The village was thriving, and not just our village. All the villages around were thriving, and it remained like that until the drive for collectivization began. On the whole, collectivization was terrible.
Can You Talk About It?

Well, first of all, everyone was opposed to joining the kolkhoz, but people were forced to join. If someone resisted, he was punished and everything was taken from him—his land, his animals, everything he had. People were literally herded onto the kolkhoz. Then, too, the so-called wealthy peasants were singed out, although in fact there really were no wealthy peasants. Almost everybody had the same standard of living. I’ve already described our farm and how we lived. Were we rich? But during nep our father—I don’t know what to call this—but he would go into town, where there were large stores that were privately owned, and since we lived thirty kilometers away, they would give him some goods, and he would bring them home to the village where we had a little shop. We all suffered on account of this shop, because father would bring things home and sell them. And they would give him a percentage of the sales. And because of this we suffered.

**Question:**
1. What do you learn from these excerpts about the affects of the Revolution on people’s lives?
28.6 Socialist Marriage to Motherhood for the Fatherland

The following two law codes address the responsibilities of men and women in marriage in a socialist society (1926) and state aid to women with children (1944). Russia was not alone in granting medals for motherhood; Hitler and Mussolini did the same, as did republican France in the 1920s. Questions follow the second code.

28.6a Socialist Marriage


RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF HUSBAND AND WIFE

7. On registering a marriage the contracting parties may declare it to be their wish to have a common surname, either that of the husband or of the wife, or to retain their antenuptial surnames.

8. On the registration of a marriage between a person who is a citizen of the R.S.F.S.R. and a person who is a foreign citizen, each party retains his or her respective citizenship. Change in citizenship of such persons may be effected in the simplified manner provided for by the Union laws....

9. Both husband and wife enjoy full liberty in the choice of their respective trades and occupations. The manner in which their joint household is conducted is determined by the mutual agreement of the two contracting parties. A change of residence by either husband or wife does not oblige the other marriage partner to follow the former.

10. Property which belonged to either husband or wife prior to their marriage remains the separate property of each of them. Property acquired by husband and wife during continuance of their marriage is regarded as their joint property. The share belonging to either husband or wife shall, in case of dispute, be determined by the court.

Note.—The rights of either husband or wife in regard to the use of land and in regard to property used in common and forming part of a peasant household are defined by Sections 66 and 67 of the Land Code and by the enactments published to supplement the same.

11. Section 10 of the present code extends also to the property of persons married de facto though not registered, provided such persons recognize their mutual status of husband and wife, or their marital relationship is established as a fact by a court on the basis of the actual conditions under which they live.

12. Proof of joint cohabitation is sufficient for the court to establish marital cohabitation in cases where the marriage has not been registered, provided that in addition to proof of joint cohabitation proof of a common household be adduced and that statements have been made to third persons either in personal correspondence or in other documents tending to prove the existence of marital relations, taking also into consideration such circumstances as the presence or absence of mutual material support, joint raising of children, and the like.

13. The husband and wife may enter into any contractual relations with each other regarding property provided they are lawful. Agreements between husband and wife intended to restrict the property rights of the wife or of the husband are invalid and are not binding on third parties or on the husband or wife, who may at any time refuse to carry them out.

14. When either husband or wife is in need and unable to work he or she is entitled to receive alimony from the other conjugal partner, if the court finds that the latter is able to support the former. A husband or wife in need of support but able to work is likewise entitled to alimony during the period of his or her unemployment.

15. The right of a husband or wife in need and unable to work to receive alimony from the other conjugal partner continues even after the dissolution of the marriage until there has been a change in the conditions which according to Section 14 of the present code serve as a basis for the receipt of alimony, but not for a period exceeding one year from the time of the dissolution of the marriage. The amount of alimony to be paid to a needy unemployed husband or wife in case of dissolution of the marriage is fixed by the court for a period not exceeding six months and shall not exceed the corresponding amount of Social Insurance relief.
16. The right to receive alimony both during marriage and after its dissolution extends also to persons who are married de facto, though not registered, provided they fall within the purview of Sections 11 and 12 of the present code.

17. A marriage is dissolved by the death of one of the parties to it or by a declaration of the presumptive death of either the husband or the wife through a notary public or court.

18. During the lifetime of both parties to a marriage the marriage may be dissolved either by the mutual consent of both parties to it or upon the ex parte application of either of them.

19. During the lifetime of both parties, the dissolution of a marriage (divorce) may be registered at the Civil Registrar’s Office, whether the marriage was registered or unregistered, provided that in the latter case it had been established as a fact by the court in accordance with Section 12 of the present code.

20. The fact that a marriage has been dissolved may also be established by a court, if the divorce was not registered.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to both sections a. and b.
1. What are the basic goals of each document?
2. What concerns underlie each document?
3. How did the changes in Russia between 1926 and 1944 affect the family, relations between men and women, and between the family and the state?
4. How do the ideas and concerns expressed in these documents compare with the United States in the 1920s and 40s and today?
28.6b Motherhood for the Fatherland


Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on increase of State aid to pregnant women, mothers with many children and unmarried mothers; on strengthening measures for the protection of motherhood and childhood; on the establishment of the title “Heroine Mother”; and on the institution of the order “Motherhood Glory” and the “Motherhood Medal”

Care for children and mothers and the strengthening of the family have always been among the most important tasks of the Soviet State. In safeguarding the interests of mother and child, the State is rendering great material aid to pregnant women and mothers for the support and upbringing of their children. During and after the War, when many families face more considerable material difficulties, a further extension of State aid measures is necessary.

With a view to increasing the material assistance to pregnant women, mothers with many children, and unmarried mothers, and to encouraging large families and providing increased protection for motherhood and childhood the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Decrees:

SECTION I
ON THE INCREASE OF STATE AID TO MOTHERS WITH MANY CHILDREN AND UNMARRIED MOTHERS

It is Decreed:

Article 1
That in place of the existing regulation which gives State aid to mothers with six children at the birth of the seventh and of each subsequent child, State assistance shall be given to mothers (either with husbands or widowed) who have two children, on the birth of the third and of each subsequent child.

Article 2

In assessing the amount of State assistance to mothers with many children, those children who perished or disappeared without trace on the fronts of the Patriotic War are included.

Article 3
To establish State assistance to single (unmarried) mothers for support and upbringing of children born after the publication of the present Decree, in the following amounts:

100 rubles monthly for 1 child
150 “ “ for 2 children
200 “ “ for 3 or more children

State assistance to unmarried mothers is paid until the children reach 12 years of age.
Unmarried mothers with 3 or more children receive the State assistance laid down in the present article, in addition to the regular assistance to mothers with many children which is received in accordance with article 2 of the present Decree.

When an unmarried mother marries, the right to assistance laid down in the present article is retained by her.
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Article 4

If an unmarried mother wishes to place a child to which she has given birth in a children’s institution for its upbringing, the children’s institution is obliged to accept the child, to support and bring it up entirely at the expense of the State. 

The mother of the child has the right to remove her child from the children’s institution and to bring it up herself. While the child is in the children’s institution, State assistance for the child is not paid.

SECTION II
ON THE INCREASE OF PRIVILEGES FOR PREGNANT WOMEN AND MOTHERS AND ON MEASURES TO EXTEND THE NETWORK OF INSTITUTIONS FOR THE PROTECTION OF MOTHERHOOD AND CHILDHOOD

Article 6

To increase the leave of absence for pregnancy and childbirth for women workers and women office employees from 63 calendar days to 77 calendar days, establishing the length of the leave of absence at 35 calendar days before the birth and 42 calendar days after the birth, assistance to be given during this period at the expense of the State to the amount previously laid down. In cases of difficult births or the birth of twins, leave of absence after birth is increased to 56 calendar days.

To instruct the directors of factories and offices to provide pregnant women with their regular leave of absence, at a suitable time in relation to the leave of absence for pregnancy and birth.

Article 7

Pregnant women from the 4th month of pregnancy not to be put on overtime work in factories and offices, and women with children at the breast not to be put on nightwork during the period the child is breast-fed.

Article 8

To double the normal ration of supplementary food for pregnant women, beginning with the 6th month of pregnancy, and for nursing mothers for four months of the nursing period.

Article 9

To instruct the directors of factories and offices to give aid to pregnant women and nursing mothers in the form of supplementary foodstuffs from their auxiliary farms.

Article 10

To reduce by 50 per cent. the fees for places in crèches and kindergartens for:

Parents with 3 children and earning up to 400 rubles a month.
Parents with 4 children and earning up to 600 rubles a month.
Parents with 5 or more children irrespective of earnings.

Article 11

To instruct the Council of People’s Commissars of the U.S.S.R.:

(a) To confirm the plan for the organization in Republics and Regions of additional Homes for Mother and Child and also of special rest homes for unmarried women needing them and for weakened nursing mothers, the women resting there to be given work in them according to their strength.

(b) To confirm the plan for extending the network of children’s institutions under the People’s Commissariats and departments, with a view to covering fully all children needing such institutions; to provide for extension of the network of children’s consulting centres and milk kitchens, organization of crèches for breast-fed children, of evening groups in the kindergartens and maternity institutions in the districts liberated from the German invaders.
(c) To provide for the compulsory organization in factories and offices employing women on a mass scale of crèches, kindergartens, rooms for the feeding of breast-fed children, and personal hygiene rooms for women.

(d) To instruct the People’s Commissariats to include in their plans of industrial construction the building of children’s institutions (crèches, kindergartens, Mother and Child Rooms), calculated to cover fully all the children of the women workers and office employees of the given enterprise who require such services.

(e) To confirm measures for the considerable expansion of the production of children’s clothing, footwear, sanitary and hygienic articles for children, and other articles required by children both for children’s institutions and for sale to the population, and measures also for the extension of the network of children’s clothing factories and of the network of Mother and Child shops.

SECTION III

Article 12
To institute a “Motherhood Medal”—1st and 2nd class—for award to mothers who have given birth to and brought up:

- 5 children 2nd class medal
- 6 children 1st class medal

Article 13
To establish the Order “Motherhood Glory”—1st, 2nd and 3rd class—for award to mothers who have given birth to and brought up:

- 7 children 3rd class
- 8 children 2nd class
- 9 children 1st class

Article 14
To establish that mothers who have given birth to and brought up 10 children shall receive the title of honour “Heroine Mother” with award of the Order Heroine Mother and certificate of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

SECTION IV
ON TAXES ON BACHELORS, SINGLE CITIZENS, AND CITIZENS OF THE U.S.S.R. WITH SMALL FAMILIES

Article 16
As a modification of the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. dated November 21, 1941, “On taxes on bachelors, single and childless citizens of the U.S.S.R.,” to establish that a tax is paid by citizens—men between the ages of 20 and 50 years, and women between the ages of 20 and 45 years—having no children and citizens having 1 or 2 children.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to both sections a. and b.

1. What are the basic goals of each document?
2. What concerns underlie each document?
3. How did the changes in Russia between 1926 and 1944 affect the family, relations between men and women, and between the family and the state?
4. How do the ideas and concerns expressed in these documents compare with the United States in the 1920s and 40s and today?
28.7 Stalin’s First Five Year Plan

In 1933, Stalin spoke to the Central Communist Party about the objectives and results of the first Five Year Plan. His immediate audience, which owed complete obedience to Stalin, was well aware of the loss of human life that occurred during those five years, since they had been charged with carrying out his purges and harsh measures. This speech was then distributed more widely.


What was the fundamental task of the five-year plan?
The fundamental task of the five-year plan was to transfer our country, with its backward, and in part medieval, technology, on to the lines of new, modern technology.
The fundamental task of the five-year plan was to convert the U.S.S.R. from an agrarian and weak country, dependent upon the caprices of the capitalist countries, into an industrial and powerful country, fully self-reliant and independent of the caprices of world capitalism.
The fundamental task of the five-year plan was, in converting the U.S.S.R. into an industrial country, to completely oust the capitalist elements, to widen the front of socialist forms of economy, and to create the economic basis for the abolition of classes in the U.S.S.R., for the building of a socialist society....
The fundamental task of the five-year plan was to transfer small and scattered agriculture on to the lines of large-scale collective farming, so as to ensure the economic basis of socialism in the countryside and thus to eliminate the possibility of the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R.

Finally, the task of the five-year plan was to create all the necessary technical and economic prerequisites for increasing to the utmost the defense capacity of the country, enabling it to organize determined resistance to any attempt at military intervention from abroad, to any attempt at military attack from abroad....
The main link in the five-year plan was heavy industry, with machine building as its core. For only heavy industry is capable of reconstructing both industry as a whole, transport and agriculture, and of putting them on their feet. It was necessary to begin the fulfillment of the five-year plan with heavy industry. Consequently, the restoration of heavy industry had to be made the basis of the fulfillment of the five-year plan....

But the restoration and development of heavy industry, particularly in such a backward and poor country as ours was at the beginning of the five-year plan period, is an extremely difficult task; for, as is well known, heavy industry calls for enormous financial expenditure and the existence of a certain minimum of experienced technical forces.... Did the Party know this, and did it take this into account? Yes, it did. Not only did the Party know this, but it announced it for all to hear. The Party knew how heavy industry had been built in Britain, Germany, and America. It knew that in those countries heavy industry had been built either with the aid of big loans, plundering other countries, or by both methods simultaneously. The Party knew that those paths were closed to our country. What, then, did it count on? It counted on our country’s own resources. It counted on the fact that, with a Soviet government at the helm, and the land, industry, transport, the banks and trade nationalized, we could pursue a regime of the strictest economy in order to accumulate sufficient resources for the restoration and development of heavy industry. The Party declared frankly that this would call for serious sacrifices, and that it was our duty openly and consciously to make these sacrifices if we wanted to achieve our goal....

What are the results of the five-year plan in four years in the sphere of industry?
We did not have an iron and steel industry, the basis for the industrialization of the country. Now we have one.
We did not have a tractor industry. Now we have one.
We did not have an automobile industry. Now we have one.
We did not have a machine-tool industry. Now we have one.
We did not have a big and modern chemical industry. Now we have one.
We did not have a real and big industry for the production of modern agricultural machinery. Now we have one. We did not have an aircraft industry. Now we have one. In output of electrical power we were last on the list. Now we rank among the first. In output of oil products and coal we were last on the list. Now we rank among the first.... Finally, as a result of all this the Soviet Union has been converted from a weak country, unprepared for defense, into a country mighty in defense, a country prepared for every contingency, a country capable of producing on a mass scale all modern means of defense and of equipping its army with them in the event of an attack from abroad....

Questions:
1. What were the goals of the Five Year Plan? Were they met or not?
2. What methods did he use to implement the plan?
3. How did these methods differ from the way industrialization occurred in western Europe?
28.8 Leader of the NAZI Women’s Organization

Gertrud Scholtz-Klink became “National Women’s Leader” in November 1934. Daughter of a small-town surveyor, she was a social worker who married three times. When her first husband died of a heart attack in an election meeting, she took his place as political speaker, in order to encourage participation among women. Her organizational abilities and the fact that she raised eleven children helped her to rise through the ranks to the top leadership position for women, a position that remained subordinate to Hitler and the male hierarchy.


A year has passed since the day we met here for the first time as a unified group of German women, to demonstrate our willingness to cooperate in our Führer’s work of reconstruction.

This year has been inspired by the desire to mark our times with our best efforts so that our descendants will be able to forget our nation’s fourteen years of weakness and sickness. We women knew, quite as well as German men, that we had to teach a people, partially sunk in self-despair, attitudes requiring those very qualities that had been deliberately suppressed in our nation. In order to carry out our intention to unite and to march shoulder to shoulder, we demanded honor and loyalty, strength and sincerity, humility and respect—such virtues appeal to the soul of a people. In matters of the soul, however, it is no longer the majority who decide, but the strength and inner freedom of upright individuals. Therefore, we could only fulfill our task if it enabled us to penetrate the soul of the individual....

When we came to the point of recognizing that the human eye reflected a nation’s soul, we had to reach the women of our nation, once and for all, through our labor on women’s behalf. Because as mothers our women have carried the heavy burden of the past fourteen years—and the ruins of the war and post-war period—in their hearts; and as future mothers other women must presently develop an understanding of the demands of our times—to both of these groups we dedicated the first important path that we built to the hearts of German women: our ReichsMaternity Service.

Urged on by the tired eyes of many overburdened mothers and the responsibility for the coming generation of mothers, we joined together under the leadership of the National Socialist Women’s Association [N. S. Frauenchaft] and appealed to the German women especially trained for this work. When I tell you today that, between the 1st of October 1934 and the 1st of April 1935, we enrolled more than 201,700 women in 7,653 maternity school courses in about 2,000 locations throughout the German Reich, it may not seem much at first glance. But we must not forget that we had no funds and met with much opposition, and that we had no patronage since we were quite unknown. But we did have absolute and unshakable faith. None of our traveling teachers asked: How much will I earn? or, What are my pension rights? We have done this work out of a sense of duty to our nation—and our nation has responded. On Mothers’ Day this year we were presented with 3.5 million marks for this work of maternity training. Moreover, on this day of honor for the mothers of Germany, when we all collected money in the streets, we found that our humblest fellow-countrymen were the most generous. This was surely the most wonderful reward for all of us, but it also gave practical evidence of where our major efforts must be directed. And when, only one or two months from now, we open our Reichs-Maternity School in Wedding, formerly one of the most solidly “red” quarters of Berlin, we will be able to congratulate ourselves on having prepared a place, on behalf of our Party and our State, that will reveal to all of you how we are solving our problems.

In this place, mothers of all ages and classes discuss their problems and their needs. Here they will become acquainted with the aims of the National Socialist state and will receive inspiration to pass them on from woman to woman, and thus to recover our national faith in ourselves. If by means of the Reichs-Maternity Service we gradually succeed in brightening the eyes of our mothers and in bringing some joy into their often difficult lives, perhaps even a song to their lips, we may consider that we have accomplished our task, because happy mothers will raise happy children. But our Reichs-Maternity Service must also make a point of teaching our young and future mothers those things that a liberal era did not teach them—for the omission of which our nation has had to pay dearly—namely, that through marriage we consciously become mothers of the nation; that is, we understand and share every national requirement laid upon German men, and that, therefore, as wives we must unconditionally become the companions of our men—not merely in personal terms, but in all national requirements.
First we pursued our task by appealing to the mothers of the nation, and then to that generation closest to the mothers, the girls between eighteen and twenty-five years of age. We called upon them to join voluntarily in the chain of helping hands and to create a relationship of unbreakable trust among German women. And they came, our girls of the German Women’s Labor Service.

You, my girls, who have now spent two years with me in the struggle for the autonomy of the German people, have learned to carry every responsibility and have become the inspiration of our mothers. No matter whether our girls are cheerfully helping German settlers on the moors in their difficult work of creating new homes; or whether they are working in Rhön, Spessart, or in eastern Bavaria, hand in hand with the National Socialist Welfare Organization in giving help to careworn adults and joyless children, in reawakening a taste for beauty and a belief in themselves; or whether they are helping German peasant women harvest from dawn to dusk—one thing unites them all, for they know: We are needed, we are of some use, and we are playing our part in the rebirth of our nation. And what is perhaps even more important, they come to know themselves, because the German land or the German plight confronted them with inexorable demands. Faced with the realities of life, neither beauty nor examinations, neither wealth nor connections suffice—only the value of personal character will stand the test. Because we have experienced all of this so deeply, we have demanded compulsory labor service for girls exactly as for German men.

Since at present we cannot satisfy all these demands, owing to financial and organizational difficulties, we have begun by making only those demands that professional and university women can take the lead in supporting. German women students have accepted the demand for compulsory labor service with the utmost readiness. But in spite of this, for the next few years our principal task will be to keep German women students constantly in touch with the vital realities of our nation, in contrast to the detachment of their private academic existence that was formerly so common. At one time, it was considered the height of achievement in Germany to know everything and thereby to lose the simpleness of childhood. We wish to impress on our women at the universities that, as university students, they must place the intellectual abilities entrusted to them at the disposal of their nation with the same humility as that with which women workers and mothers fulfill their duties.... This summer our women students began to live in this manner and thereby joined the chain of helping hands we have created among ourselves. They went into German factories and replaced working women and mothers, enabling them to have a real vacation in order to regain strength for their hard day-to-day existence. For it is these women, these mothers of families, who are hardest hit by the short working hours or unemployment of their husbands, because at home their children sap their strength. We were able to carry out this work of mutual assistance without great expenditure, owing to the solidarity of German women students and the cooperation of industrial management, the Labor Front, the National-Socialist Welfare Organization, and the National-Socialist Women’s League.

This brings us to the point where we must consider the millions of German women who perform heavy labor in factories day in and day out. If we consider the human eye as the measure of a people’s soul, it is here that we find the deepest imprints of that fourteen-year-long attempt to strangle our national soul. We know that a great deal of industrial work must always be done by women, but it is essential that the woman at the machine should feel that she, in her position, represents her nation, in common with all other women. That is to say, we awaken her consciousness so that she will say to herself: “This is my responsibility, my attitude determines the attitude of the nation.” In recent times, this very basic consciousness of recognition of the importance of the tight mesh of joint national labor of individuals was not instilled. For this reason, we in the Women’s Section of the German Labor Front have given the women workers their own women trustees and their own district and regional superintendents chosen from their own ranks, in order that they too may play their part in the labor of the nation. We are well aware that it is most difficult to include the working woman in the general scheme of responsibilities, because she is hardest hit by problems of unemployment and reduced working hours. But since we women are not directly concerned with financial relief, the help we can give must be indirect, though equally effective. We begin by giving advice to women and girls in the form of courses in cooking, sewing, and child-care in the maternity schools. In this way we have given considerable assistance to over 80,000 women workers and workers’ wives in the past year....
Our most important effort, however, toward the education of working women for a national socialist life-style has been our appointment of female social workers among the women working in factories. These female social workers (upon whom we are forced to make extraordinary demands, both human and political) must stand by the side of the factory managers and counsellors responsible for the welfare of the workers and, as comrades of the women workers, they must help to introduce them to all other women’s organizations and to ensure that the individual woman factory worker feels truly committed to her own labor....

I must deal briefly with a question that is constantly brought to our attention, that is, how our present attitude toward life differs from that of the previous women’s movement. First, in principle we permit only Germans to be leaders of German women and to concern themselves with matters of importance to Germans. Second, as a matter of principle we never have demanded, nor shall we ever demand, equal rights for women with the men of our nation. Instead we shall always make women’s special interests dependent upon the needs of our entire nation. All further considerations will follow from this unconditional intertwining of the collective fate of the nation.

Questions:
1. What were the goals of the NAZI Women’s organization? What did it oppose?
2. What does this organization say about women’s rights?
3. What kinds of appeals did Scholtz-Klink make to bring women into the party and to help build the NAZI state?
4. Why might the organization have attracted many members?
29.1 Adolf Hitler: The Obersalzberg Speech

In August 1939, Adolf Hitler (1889–1945) and Joseph Stalin (1879–1953) shocked the world with their announcement of a nonaggression pact. In many ways, the pact signaled the start of World War II. In the document included below, Hitler explained his reasons for signing the pact and for igniting the war that followed.


Decision to attack Poland was arrived at in spring. Originally there was fear that because of the political constellation we would have to strike at the same time against England, France, Russia and Poland. This risk too we should have had to take. Göring had demonstrated to us that his Four-Year Plan is a failure and that we are at the end of our strength, if we do not achieve victory in a coming war.

Since the autumn of 1938 and since I have realised that Japan will not go with us unconditionally and that Musсолini is endangered by that nitwit of a King and the treacherous scoundrel of a Crown Prince, I decided to go with Stalin. After all there are only three great statesmen in the world, Stalin, I and Mussolini. Mussolini is the weakest, for he has been able to break the power neither of the crown nor of the Church. Stalin and I are the only ones who visualise the future. So in a few weeks hence I shall stretch out my hand to Stalin at the common German-Russian frontier and with him undertake to re-distribute the world.

Our strength lies in our quickness and in our brutality; Genghis Khan has sent millions of women and children into death knowingly and with a light heart. History sees in him only the great founder of States. As to what the weak Western European civilisation asserts about me, that is of no account. I have given the command and I shall shoot everyone who utters one word of criticism, for the goal to be obtained in the war is not that of reaching certain lines but of physically demolishing the opponent. And so for the present only in the East I have put my death-head formations\(^1\) in place with the command relentlessly and without compassion to send into death many women and children of Polish origin and language. Only thus we can gain the living space that we need. Who after all is today speaking about the destruction of the Armenians?

Colonel-General von Brauchitsch has promised me to bring the war against Poland to a close within a few weeks. Had he reported to me that he needs two years or even only one year, I should not have given the command to march and should have allied myself temporarily with England instead of Russia for we cannot conduct a long war. To be sure a new situation has arisen. I experienced those poor worms Daladier and Chamberlain in Munich. They will be too cowardly to attack. They won’t go beyond a blockade. Against that we have our autarchy and the Russian raw materials.

Poland will be depopulated and settled with Germans. My pact with the Poles was merely conceived of as a gaining of time. As for the rest, gentlemen, the fate of Russia will be exactly the same as I am now going through with in the case of Poland. After Stalin’s death—he is a very sick man—we will break the Soviet Union. Then there will begin the dawn of the German rule of the earth.

The little States cannot scare me. After Kemal’s death Turkey is governed by “cretins” and half idiots. Carol of Roumania is through and through the corrupt slave of his sexual instincts. The King of Belgium and the Nordic kings are soft jumping jacks who are dependent upon the good digestions of their over-eating and tired peoples.

We shall have to take into the bargain the defection of Japan. I save Japan a full year’s time. The Emperor is a counterpart to the last Czar—weak, cowardly, undecided. May he become a victim of the revolution. My going together with Japan never was popular. We shall continue to create disturbances in the Far East and in Arabia. Let us think as “gentlemen” and let us see in these peoples at best lacquered half maniacs who are anxious to experience the whip.

The opportunity is as favourable as never before. I have but one worry, namely that Chamberlain or some other such pig of a fellow (“Saukerl”) will come at the last moment with proposals or with ratting (“Umfall”). He will fly down the stairs, even if I shall personally have to trample on his belly in the eyes of the photographers.

---

\(^1\) The S.S. Death’s Head formations were principally employed in peacetime in guarding concentration camps. With the S.S. Verfügungstruppen, they formed the nucleus of the Waffen S.S.
No, it is too late for this. The attack upon and the destruction of Poland begins Saturday early. I shall let a few companies in Polish uniform attack in Upper Silesia or in the Protectorate. Whether the world believes it is quite indifferent (“scheissegal”). The world believes only in success.

For you, gentlemen, fame and honour are beginning as they have not since centuries. Be hard, be without mercy, act more quickly and brutally than the others. The citizens of Western Europe must tremble with horror. That is the most human way of conducting a war. For it scares the others off.

The new method of conducting war corresponds to the new drawing of the frontiers. A war extending from Reval, Lublin, Kaschau to the mouth of the Danube. The rest will be given to the Russians. Ribbentrop has orders to make every offer and to accept every demand. In the West I reserve to myself the right to determine the strategically best line. Here one will be able to work with Protectorate regions, such as Holland, Belgium and French Lorraine.

And now, on to the enemy, in Warsaw we will celebrate our reunion.

The speech was received with enthusiasm. Göring jumped on a table, thanked blood-thirstily and made blood-thirsty promises. He danced like a wild man. The few that had misgivings remained quiet. (Here a line of the memorandum is missing, in order no doubt to protect the source of information.)

**Question:**
1. Hitler asks, “Who after all is today speaking about the destruction of the Armenians?” What does this suggest about his views of the twentieth century’s first large-scale genocide?
29.2 Winston Churchill: “Their Finest Hour”—House of Commons, 18 June 1940

As Prime Minister of Britain during World War II, Winston Churchill (1874–1965) played a crucial role in maintaining moral at home and in spurring allies to come to Britain’s defense. At the time the speech below was given, the German army had overrun France and had driven the British Expeditionary force back across the English Channel. Churchill’s job was to ensure the British people did not give in to resignation and despair.


I spoke the other day of the colossal military disaster which occurred when the French High Command failed to withdraw the Northern Armies from Belgium at the moment when they knew that the French front was decisively broken at Sedan and on the Meuse. This delay entailed the loss of fifteen or sixteen French divisions and threw out of action for the critical period the whole of the British Expeditionary Force. Our Army and 120,000 French troops were indeed rescued by the British Navy from Dunkirk but only with the loss of their cannon, vehicles and modern equipment. This loss inevitably took some weeks to repair, and in the first two of those weeks the battle in France has been lost. When we consider the heroic resistance made by the French Army against heavy odds in this battle, the enormous losses inflicted upon the enemy and the evident exhaustion of the enemy, it may well be thought that these twenty-five divisions of the best-trained and best-equipped troops might have turned the scale. However, General Weygand had to fight without them. Only three British divisions or their equivalent were able to stand in the line with their French comrades. They had suffered severely, but they had fought well. We sent every man we could to France as fast as we could re-equip and transport their formations.

I am not reciting these facts for the purpose of recrimination. That I judge to be utterly futile and even harmful. We cannot afford it. I recite them in order to explain why it was we did not have, as we could have had, between twelve and fourteen British divisions fighting in the line in this great battle instead of only three. Now I put all this aside. I put it on the shelf, from which the historians, when they have time, will select their documents to tell their stories. We have to think of the future and not of the past. This also applies in a small way to our own affairs at home. There are many who would hold an inquest in the House of Commons on the conduct of the Governments—and of Parliaments, for they are in it, too—during the years which led up to this catastrophe. They seek to indict those who were responsible for the guidance of our affairs. This also would be a foolish and pernicious process. There are too many in it. Let each man search his conscience and search his speeches. I frequently search mine.

Of this I am quite sure, that if we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future. Therefore, I cannot accept the drawing of any distinctions between Members of the present Government. It was formed at a moment of crisis in order to unite all the parties and all sections of opinion. It has received the almost unanimous support of both Houses of Parliament. Its Members are going to stand together, and, subject to the authority of the House of Commons, we are going to govern the country and fight the war. It is absolutely necessary at a time like this that every Minister who tries each day to do his duty shall be respected; and their subordinates must know that their chiefs are not threatened men, men who are here today and gone tomorrow, but that their directions must be punctually and faithfully obeyed. Without this concentrated power we cannot face what lies before us. I should not think it would be very advantageous for the House to prolong this Debate this afternoon under conditions of public stress. Many facts are not clear that will be clear in a short time. We are to have a Secret Session on Thursday, and I should think that would be a better opportunity for the many earnest expressions of opinion which Members will desire to make and for the House to discuss vital matters without having everything read the next morning by our dangerous foes.

The disastrous military events which have happened during, the past fortnight have not come to me with any sense of surprise. Indeed, I indicated a fortnight ago as clearly as I could to the House that the worst possibilities were open; and I made it perfectly clear then that whatever happened in France would make no difference to the resolve of Britain and the British Empire to fight on, ‘if necessary for years, if necessary alone.’ During the last few days we have successfully brought off the great majority of the troops we had on the lines of communication in France; and seven-eighths of the troops we have sent to France since the beginning of the war—that is to say, about 350,000 out of 400,000 men—are safely back in this country. Others are still fighting with the French, and fighting with considerable success in their local encounters against the enemy. We have also brought back a great mass of stores, rifles and munitions of all kinds which had been accumulated in France during the last nine months.
We have, therefore, in this island today a very large and powerful military force. This force comprises all our best-
trained and our finest troops, including scores of thousands of those who have already measured their quality against the
Germans and found themselves at no disadvantage. We have under arms at the present time in this island over a million
and a quarter men. Behind these we have the Local Defence Volunteers, numbering half a million, only a portion of whom,
however, are yet armed with rifles or other firearms. We have incorporated into our Defence Forces every man for whom
we have a weapon. We expect very large additions to our weapons in the near future, and in preparation for this we intend
forthwith to call up, drill and train further large numbers. Those who are not called up, or else are employed upon the vast
business of munitions production in all its branches—and their ramifications are innumerable—will serve their country best
by remaining at their ordinary work until they receive their summons. We have also over here Dominions armies. The
Canadians had actually landed in France, but have now been safely withdrawn, much disappointed, but in perfect order,
with all their artillery and equipment. And these very high-class forces from the Dominions will now take part in the
defence of the Mother Country.

Lest the account which I have given of these large forces should raise the question: Why did they not take part
in the great battle in France? I must make it clear that, apart from the divisions training and organizing at home, only twelve
divisions were equipped to fight upon a scale which justified their being sent abroad. And this was fully up to the number
which the French had been led to expect would be available in France at the ninth month of the war. The rest of our
forces at home having fighting value for home defence which will, of course, steadily increase every week that passes. Thus,
the invasion of Great Britain would at this time require the transportation across the sea of hostile armies on a very large
scale, and after they been so transported they would have to be continually maintained with all the masses of munitions and
supplies which are required for continuous battle—as continuous battle it will surely be.

Here is where we come to the Navy—and after all, we have a Navy. Some people seem to forget that we have a
Navy. We must remind them. For the last thirty years I have been concerned in discussions about the possibilities of over-
seas invasion, and I took the responsibility on behalf of the Admiralty, at the beginning of the last war, of allowing all reg-
ular troops to be sent out of the country. That was a very serious step to take, because our Territorials had only just been
called up and were quite untrained. Therefore, this island was for several months practically denuded of fighting troops. The
Admiralty had confidence at that time in their ability to prevent a mass invasion even though at that time the Germans had
a magnificent battle fleet the proportion of ten to sixteen, even though they were capable of fighting a general engagement
every day and any day, whereas now they have only a couple of heavy ships worth speaking of—the Scharnhorst and the
Gneisenau. We are also told that the Italian Navy is to come out and gain sea superiority in these waters. If they seriously
intend it, I shall only say that we shall be delighted to offer Signor Mussolini a free and safeguarded passage through the
Straits of Gibraltar in order that he may play the part to which he aspires. There is a general curiosity in the British Fleet
to find out whether the Italians are up to the level they were at in the last war or whether they have fallen off at all.

Therefore, it seems to me that as far as seaborne invasion on a great scale is concerned, we are far more capable
of meeting it today than we were at many periods in the last war and during the early months of this war, before our other
troops were trained, and while the BEF had proceeded abroad. Now, the Navy have never pretended to be able to prevent
raids by bodies of 5,000 or 10,000 men flung suddenly across and thrown ashore at several points on the coast some dark
night or foggy morning. The efficacy of sea-power, especially under modern conditions, depends upon the invading force
being of large size. It has to be of large size, in view of our military strength, to be of any use. If it is of large size, then
the Navy have something they can find and meet and, as it were, bite on. Now we must remember that even five divisions,
however lightly equipped, would require 200 to 250 ships, and with modern air reconnaissance and photography it would
not be easy to collect such an armada, marshal it and conduct it across the sea without any powerful naval forces to escort
it; and there would be very great possibilities, to put it mildly, that this armada would be intercepted long before it reached
the coast, and all the men drowned in the sea or, at the worst, blown to pieces with their equipment while they were trying
to land. We also have a great system of minefields, recently strongly reinforced, through which we alone know the chan-
nels. If the enemy tries to sweep passages through these minefields, it will be the task of the Navy to destroy the
minesweepers and any other forces employed to protect them. There should be no difficulty in this, owing to our great su-
periority at sea.

Those are the regular, well-tested, well-proved arguments on which we have relied during many years in peace and
war. But the question is whether there are any new methods by which those solid assurances can be circumvented. Odd as
it may seem, some attention has been given to this by the Admiralty, whose prime duty and responsibility it is to destroy
any large seaborne expeditions before it reaches, or at the moment when it reaches these shores. It would not be a good thing
for me to go into details of this. It might suggest ideas to other people which they have not thought of, and they would not
be likely to give us any of their ideas in exchange. All I will say is that untiring vigilance and mind-searching must be
devoted to the subject, because the enemy is crafty and cunning and full of novel treacheries and stratagems. The House
may be assured that the utmost ingenuity is being displayed and imagination is being evoked from large numbers of com-
petent officers, well trained in tactics and thoroughly up to date, to measure and counterwork novel possibilities. Untiring
vigilance and untiring searching of the mind is being, and must be, devoted to the subject, because, remember, the enemy is crafty and there is no dirty trick he will not do.

Some people will ask why, then, was it that the British Navy was not able to prevent the movement of a large army from Germany into Norway across the Skaggerak? But the conditions in the Channel and in the North Sea are in no way like those which prevail in the Skaggerak. In the Skaggerak, because of the distance, we could give no air support to our surface ships, and consequently, lying as we did close to the enemy’s main air power, we were compelled to use only our submarines. We could not enforce the decisive blockade or interruption which is possible from surface vessels. Our submarines took a heavy toll but could not, by themselves, prevent the invasion of Norway. In the Channel and in the North Sea, on the other hand, our superior naval surface forces, aided by our submarines, will operate with close and effective air assistance.

This brings me, naturally, to the great question of invasion from the air, and of the impending struggle between the British and German Air Forces. It seems quite clear that no invasion on a scale beyond the capacity of our land forces to crush speedily is likely to take place from the air until our Air Force has been definitely overpowered. In the meantime, there may be raids by parachute troops and attempted descents of airborne soldiers. We should be able to give those gentry a warm reception, both in the air and on the ground, if they reach it in any condition to continue the dispute. But the great question is: Can we break Hitler’s air weapon? Now, of course, it is a very great pity that we have not got an Air Force at least equal to that of the most powerful enemy within striking distance of these shores. But we have a very powerful Air Force which has proved itself far superior in quality, both in men and in many types of machine, to what we have met so far in the numerous and fierce air battles which have been fought with the Germans. In France, where we were at a considerable disadvantage and lost many machines on the ground when they were standing round the aerodromes, we were accustomed to inflict in the air losses of as much as two to two-and-a-half to one. In the fighting over Dunkirk, which was a sort of no-man’s land, we undoubtedly beat the German Air Force, and gained the mastery of the local air, inflicting here a loss of three or four to one day after day. Anyone who looks at the photographs which were published a week or so ago of the re-embarkation, showing the masses of troops assembled on the beach and forming an ideal target for hours at a time, must realize that this re-embarkation would not have been possible unless the enemy had resigned all hope of recovering air superiority at that time and at that place.

In the defence of this island the advantages to the defenders will be much greater than they were in the fighting around Dunkirk. We hope to improve on the rate of three or four to one which was realized at Dunkirk; and in addition all our injured machines and their crews which get down safe—and, surprisingly, a very great many injured machines and men do get down safely in modern air fighting—all of these will fall, in an attack upon these islands, on friendly soil and live to fight another day; whereas all the injured enemy machines and their complements will be total losses as far as the war is concerned.

During the great battle in France, we gave very powerful and continuous aid to the French Army, both by fighters and bombers; but in spite of every kind of pressure we never would allow the entire metropolitan fighter strength of the Air Force to be consumed. This decision was painful, but it was also right, because the fortunes of the battle in France could not have been decisively affected even if we had thrown in our entire fighter force. That battle was lost by the unfortunate strategical opening, by the extraordinary and unforeseen power of the armoured columns and by the great preponderance of the German Army in numbers. Our fighter Air Force might easily have been exhausted as a mere accident in that great struggle, and then we should have found ourselves at the present time in a very serious plight. But as it is, I am happy to inform the House that our fighter strength is stronger at the present time relatively to the Germans, who have suffered terrible losses, than it has ever been; and consequently we believe ourselves possessed of the capacity to continue the war in the air under better conditions than we have ever experienced before. I look forward confidently to the exploits of our fighter pilots—these splendid men, this brilliant youth—who will have the glory of saving their native land, their island home, and all they love, from the most deadly of all attacks.

There remains, of course, the danger of bombing attacks, which will certainly be made very soon upon us by the bomber forces of the enemy. It is true that the German bomber force is superior in numbers to ours; but we have a very large bomber force also, which we shall use to strike at military targets in Germany without intermission. I do not at all underrate the severity of the ordeal which lies before us; but I believe our countrymen will show themselves capable of standing up to it, like the brave men of Barcelona, and will be able to stand up to it, and carry on in spite of it, at least as well as any other people in the world. Much will depend upon this; every man and every woman will have the chance to show the finest qualities of their race, and render the highest service to their cause. For all of us, at this time, whatever our sphere, our station, our occupation or our duties, it will be a help to remember the famous lines:
He nothing common did or mean, Upon that memorable scene.

I have thought it right upon this occasion to give the House and the country some indication of the solid, practical grounds upon which we base our inflexible resolve to continue the war. There are a good many people who say, ‘Never mind. Win or lose, sink or swim, better die than submit to tyranny—and such a tyranny.’ And I do not dissociate myself from them. But I can assure them that our professional advisers of the three Services unitedly advise that we should carry on the war, and that there are good and reasonable hopes of final victory. We have fully informed and consulted all the self-governing Dominions, these great communities far beyond the oceans who have been built up on our laws and on our civilization, and who are absolutely free to choose their course, but are absolutely devoted to the ancient Motherland, and who feel themselves inspired by the same emotions which lead me to stake our all upon duty and honour. We have fully consulted them, and I have received from their Prime Ministers, Mr Mackenzie King of Canada, Mr Menzies of Australia, Mr Fraser of New Zealand, and General Smuts of South Africa—that wonderful man, with his immense profound mind, and his eye watching from a distance the whole panorama of European affairs—I have received from all these eminent men, who all have Governments behind them elected on wide franchises, who are all there because they represent the will of their people, messages couched in the most moving terms in which they endorse our decision to fight on, and declare themselves ready to share our fortunes and to persevere to the end. That is what we are going to do.

We may now ask ourselves: In what way has our position worsened since the beginning of the war? It has worsened by the fact that the Germans have conquered a large part of the coastline of Western Europe, and many small countries have been overrun by them. This aggravates the possibilities of air attack and adds to our naval preoccupations. It in no way diminishes, but on the contrary definitely increases, the power of our long-distance blockade. Similarly, the entrance of Italy into the war increases the power of our long-distance blockade. We have stopped the worst leak by that. We do not know whether military resistance will come to an end in France or not, but should it do so, then of course, the Germans will be able to concentrate their forces, both military and industrial, upon us. But for the reasons I have given to the House these will not be found so easy to apply. If invasion has become more imminent, as no doubt it has, we, being relieved from the task of maintaining a large army in France, have far larger and more efficient forces to meet it.

If Hitler can bring under his despotic control the industries of the countries he has conquered, this will add greatly to his already vast armament output. On the other hand, this will not happen immediately, and we are now assured of immense, continuous and increasing support in supplies and munitions of all kinds from the United States; and especially of airplanes and pilots from the Dominions and across the oceans, coming from regions which are beyond the reach of enemy bombers.

I do not see how any of these factors can operate to our detriment on balance before the winter comes; and the winter will impose a strain upon the Nazi regime, with almost all Europe writhing and starving under its cruel heel, which, for all their ruthlessness, will run them very hard. We must not forget that from the moment when we declared war on the 3 September it was always possible for Germany to turn all her air force upon this country, together with any other devices of invasion she might conceive, and that France could have done little or nothing to prevent her doing so. We have, therefore, lived under this danger, in principle and in a slightly modified form, during all these months. In the meanwhile, however, we have enormously improved our methods of defence, and we have learned, what we had no right to assume at the beginning, namely, that the individual aircraft and the individual British pilot have a sure and definite superiority. Therefore, in casting up this dread balance sheet and contemplating our dangers with a disillusioned eye, I see great reason for intense vigilance and exertion but none whatever for panic or despair.

During the first four years of the last war the Allies experienced nothing but disaster and disappointment. That was our constant fear: one blow after another, terrible losses, frightful dangers. Everything miscarried. And yet at the end of those four years the morale of the Allies was higher than that of the Germans, who had moved from one aggressive triumph to another, and who stood everywhere triumphant invaders of the lands into which they had broken. During that war we repeatedly asked ourselves the question: How are we going to win? And no one was able ever to answer it with much precision, until at the end, quite suddenly, quite unexpectedly, our terrible foe collapsed before us, and we were so glutted with victory that in our folly we threw it away.
We do not yet know what will happen in France or whether the French resistance will be prolonged, both in France and in the French Empire overseas. The French Government will be throwing away great opportunities and casting adrift their future if they do not continue the war in accordance with their Treaty obligations, from which we have not felt able to release them. The House will have read the historic declaration in which, at the desire of many Frenchmen—and of our own hearts—we have proclaimed our willingness at the darkest hour in French history to conclude a union of common citizenship in this struggle. However matters may go in France or with the French Government, or other French Governments, we in this island and in the British Empire will never lose our sense of comradeship with the French people. If we are now called upon to endure what they have been suffering, we shall emulate their courage, and if final victory rewards our toils they shall share the gains, aye, and freedom shall be restored to all. We abate nothing of our just demands; not one jot or tittle do we recede. Czechs, Poles, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians have joined their causes to our own. All these shall be restored.

What General Weygand called the Battle of France is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin. Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British life, and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire. The whole fury and might of the enemy must very soon be turned on us. Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands. But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science. Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, ‘This was their finest hour.’

Question:
1. What was the purpose of this address? How does Churchill seek to achieve this purpose?
29.3 Franklin D. Roosevelt: “A Call for Sacrifice”—28 April 1942

Born into a prominent New York family, Franklin D. Roosevelt (1882–1945) was perhaps the greatest American President of the twentieth century. During his four terms, he led the United States through the Great Depression and World War II. In his 1942 “Call for Sacrifice,” Roosevelt asked all Americans to contribute to the winning of the war.


My Fellow Americans, it is nearly five months since we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. For the two years prior to that attack this country had been gearing itself up to a high level of production of munitions. And yet our war efforts had done little to dislocate the normal lives of most of us.

Since then we have dispatched strong forces of our Army and Navy, several hundred thousands of them, to bases and battlefronts thousands of miles from home. We have stepped up our war production on a scale that is testing our industrial power, our engineering genius, and our economic structure to the utmost. We have had no illusions about the fact that this is a tough job—and a long one.

American warships are now in combat in the North and South Atlantic, in the Arctic, in the Mediterranean, in the Indian Ocean, and in the North and South Pacific. American troops have taken stations in South America, Greenland, Iceland, the British Isles, the Near East, the Middle East and the Far East, the continent of Australia, and many islands of the Pacific. American war planes, manned by Americans, are flying in actual combat over all the continents and all the oceans.

On the European front the most important development of the past year has been without question the crushing counteroffensive on the part of the great armies of Russia against the powerful German army. These Russian forces have destroyed and are destroying more armed power of our enemies—troops, planes, tanks, and guns—than all the other United Nations put together.

In the Mediterranean area, matters remain on the surface much as they were. But the situation there is receiving very careful attention. Recently, we’ve received news of a change in government in what we used to know as the Republic of France—a name dear to the hearts of all lovers of liberty, a name and an institution which we hope will soon be restored to full dignity.

Throughout the Nazi occupation of France, we have hoped for the maintenance of a French government which would strive to regain independence, to reestablish the principles of “Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity,” and to restore the historic culture of France. Our policy has been consistent from the very beginning. However, we are now greatly concerned lest those who have recently come to power may seek to force the brave French people into submission to Nazi despotism.

The United Nations will take measures, if necessary, to prevent the use of French territory in any part of the world for military purposes by the Axis powers. The good people of France will readily understand that such action is essential for the United Nations to prevent assistance to the armies or navies or air forces of Germany or Italy or Japan. The overwhelming majority of the French people understand that the fight of the United Nations is fundamentally their fight, that our victory means the restoration of a free and independent France—and the saving of France from the slavery which would be imposed upon her by her external enemies and by her internal traitors.

We know how the French people really feel. We know that a deep-seated determination to obstruct every step in the Axis plan extends from occupied France through Vichy France all the way to the people of their colonies in every ocean and on every continent.

Our planes are helping in the defense of French colonies today, and soon American Flying Fortresses will be fighting for the liberation of the darkened continent of Europe itself.

In all the occupied countries there are men and women, and even little children, who have never stopped fighting, never stopped resisting, never stopped proving to the Nazis that their so-called new order will never be enforced upon free peoples.

In the German and Italian peoples themselves there’s a growing conviction that the cause of Nazism and Fascism is hopeless—that their political and military leaders have led them along the bitter road which leads not to world conquest but to final defeat. They cannot fail to contrast the present frantic speeches of these leaders with their arrogant boastings of a year ago, and two years ago.

And on the other side of the world, in the Far East, we have passed through a phase of serious losses.

We have inevitably lost control of a large portion of the Philippine Islands. But this whole nation pays tribute to the Filipino and American officers and men who held out so long on Bataan Peninsula, to those grim and gallant fighters who still hold Corregidor, where the flag flies, and to the forces that are still striking effectively at the enemy on Mindanao and other islands.
The Malayan Peninsula and Singapore are in the hands of the enemy; the Netherlands East Indies are almost entirely occupied, though resistance there continues. Many other islands are in the possession of the Japanese. But there is good reason to believe that their southward advance has been checked. Australia, New Zealand, and much other territory will be bases for offensive action—and we are determined that the territory that has been lost will be regained.

The Japanese are pressuring their northward advance against Burma with considerable power, driving toward India and China. They have been opposed with great bravery by small British and Chinese forces aided by American fliers.

The news in Burma tonight is not good. The Japanese may cut the Burma Road; but I want you to say to the gallant people of China that no matter what advances the Japanese may make, ways will be found to deliver airplanes and munitions of war to the armies of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.2

We remember that the Chinese people were the first to stand up and fight against the aggressors in this war; and in the future a still unconquerable China will play its proper role in maintaining peace and prosperity, not only in eastern Asia but in the whole world.

For every advance that the Japanese have made since they started their frenzied career of conquest, they have had to pay a very heavy toll in warships, in transports, in planes, and in men. They are feeling the effects of those losses.

It is even reported from Japan that somebody has dropped bombs on Tokyo, and on other principal centers of Japanese war industries.

If this be true, it is the first time in history that Japan has suffered such indignities.3

Although the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor was the immediate cause of our entry into the war, that event found the American people spiritually prepared for war on a worldwide scale. We went into this war fighting. We know what we are fighting for. We realize that the war has become what Hitler originally proclaimed it to be—a total war.

Not all of us can have the privilege of fighting our enemies in distant parts of the world.

Not all of us can have the privilege of working in a munitions factory or a shipyard, or on the farms or in oil fields or mines, producing the weapons or the raw materials that are needed by our armed forces.

But there is one front and one battle where everyone in the United States—every man, woman, and child—is in action, and will be privileged to remain in action throughout this war. That front is right here at home, in our daily lives, in our daily tasks. Here at home everyone will have the privilege of making whatever self-denial is necessary, not only to supply our fighting men, but to keep the economic structure of our country fortified and secure during the war and after the war.

This will require, of course, the abandonment not only of luxuries but of many other creature comforts.

Every loyal American is aware of his individual responsibility. Whenever I hear anyone saying, “The American people are complacent—they need to be aroused,” I feel like asking him to come to Washington to read the mail that floods into the White House and into all departments of this government. The one question that recurs through all these thousands of letters and messages is, “What more can I do to help my country in winning this war?”

To build the factories, to buy the materials, to pay the labor, to provide the transportation, to equip and feed and house the soldiers and sailors and marines, and to do all the thousands of things necessary in a war—all cost a lot of money, more money than has ever been spent by any nation at anytime in the long history of the world.

We are now spending, solely for war purposes, the sum of about $100 million every day in the week. But, before this year is over, that almost unbelievable rate of expenditure will be doubled.

All of this money has to be spent—and spent quickly—if we are to produce within the time now available the enormous quantities of weapons of war which we need. But the spending of these tremendous sums presents grave danger of disaster to our national economy.

When your government continues to spend these unprecedented sums for munitions month by month and year by year, that money goes into the pocketbooks and bank accounts of the people of the United States. At the same time raw materials and many manufactured goods are necessarily taken away from civilian use; and machinery and factories are being converted to war production.

You do not have to be a professor of mathematics or economics to see that if people with plenty of cash start bidding against each other for scarce goods, the price of those goods goes up.
Yesterday I submitted to the Congress of the United States a seven-point program, a program of general principles which taken together could be called the national economic policy for attaining the great objective of keeping the cost of living down.

I repeat them now to you in substance:

First, we must, through heavier taxes, keep personal and corporate profits at a low reasonable rate.

Second, we must fix ceilings on prices and rents.

Third, we must stabilize wages.

Fourth, we must stabilize farm prices.

Fifth, we must put more billions into war bonds.

Sixth, we must ration all essential commodities which are scarce.

And seventh, we must discourage installment buying, and encourage paying off debts and mortgages.

I do not think it is necessary to repeat what I said yesterday to the Congress in discussing these general principles.

The important thing to remember is that each one of these points is dependent on the others if the whole program is to work.

Some people are already taking the position that every one of the seven points is correct except the one point which steps on their own individual toes. A few seem very willing to approve self-denial—on the part of their neighbors. The only effective course of action is a simultaneous attack on all of the factors which increase the cost of living, in one comprehensive, all-embracing program covering prices and profits and wages and taxes and debts.

The blunt fact is that every single person in the United States is going to be affected by this program. Some of you will be affected more directly by one or two of these restrictive measures, but all of you will be affected indirectly by all of them.

Are you a businessman, or do you own stock in a business corporation? Well, your profits are going to be cut down to a reasonably low level by taxation. Your income will be subject to higher taxes. Indeed in these days, when every available dollar should go to the war effort, I do not think that any American citizen should have a net income in excess of $25,000 per year after payment of taxes.

Are you a retailer or a wholesaler or a manufacturer or a farmer or a landlord? Ceilings are being placed on the prices at which you can sell your goods or rent your property.

Do you work for wages? You will have to forgo higher wages for your particular job for the duration of the war.

All of us are used to spending money for things that we want, things, however, which are not absolutely essential. We will all have to forgo that kind of spending. Because we must put every dime and every dollar we can possibly spare out of our earnings into war bonds and stamps. Because the demands of the war effort require the rationing of goods of which there is not enough to go around. Because the stopping of purchases of nonessentials will release thousands of workers who are needed in the war effort.

As I told the Congress yesterday, “sacrifice” is not exactly the proper word with which to describe this program of self-denial. When, at the end of this great struggle, we shall have saved our free way of life, we shall have made no “sacrifice.”

The price for civilization must be paid in hard work and sorrow and blood. The price is not too high. If you doubt it, ask those millions who live today under the tyranny of Hitlerism.

Ask the workers of France and Norway and the Netherlands, whipped to labor by the lash, whether the stabilization of wages is too great a “sacrifice.”

Ask the farmers of Poland and Denmark and Czechoslovakia and France, looted of their livestock, starving while their own crops are stolen from their land, ask them whether parity prices are too great a “sacrifice.”

Ask the businessmen of Europe, whose enterprises have been stolen from their owners, whether the limitation of profits and personal incomes is too great a “sacrifice.”

Ask the women and children whom Hitler is starving whether the rationing of tires and gasoline and sugar is too great a “sacrifice.”

We do not have to ask them. They have already given us their agonized answers.

This great war effort must be carried through to its victorious conclusion by the indomitable will and determination of the people as one great whole.

It must not be impeded by the faint of heart.

It must not be impeded by those who put their own selfish interests above the interests of the nation.

It must not be impeded by those who pervert honest criticism into falsification of fact.

It must not be impeded by self-styled experts either in economics or military problems who know neither true figures nor geography itself.

It must not be impeded by a few bogus patriots who use the sacred freedom of the press to echo the sentiments of the propagandists in Tokyo and Berlin.
And, above all, it shall not be imperiled by the handful of noisy traitors—betrayers of America, betrayes of Christianity itself—would-be dictators who in their hearts and souls have yielded to Hitierism and would have this republic do likewise.

I shall use all of the executive power that I have to carry out the policy laid down. If it becomes necessary to ask for any additional legislation in order to attain our objective of preventing a spiral in the cost of living, I shall do so.

I know the American farmer, the American workman, and the American businessman. I know that they will gladly embrace this economy and equality of sacrifice—satisfied that it is necessary for the most vital and compelling motive in all their lives—winning through to victory.

Never in the memory of man has there been a war in which the courage, the endurance, and the loyalty of civilians played so vital a part.

Many thousands of civilians all over the world have been and are being killed or maimed by enemy action. Indeed, it is the fortitude of the common people of Britain under fire which enabled that island to stand and prevented Hitler from winning the war in 1940. The ruins of London and Coventry and other cities are today the proudest monuments to British heroism.

Our own American civilian population is now relatively safe from such disasters. And, to an ever increasing extent, our soldiers, sailors, and marines are fighting with great bravery and great skills on far distant fronts to make sure that we shall remain safe.

I should like to tell you one or two stories about the men we have in our armed forces:

There is, for example, Dr. Corydon M. Wassell. He was a missionary, well known for his good works in China. He is a simple, modest, retiring man, nearly sixty years old, but he entered the service of his country and was commissioned a lieutenant commander in the navy.

Dr. Wassell was assigned to duty in Java caring for wounded officers and men of the cruisers Houston and Marblehead which had been in heavy action in the Java seas.

When the Japanese advanced across the island, it was decided to evacuate as many as possible of the wounded to Australia. But about twelve of the men were so badly wounded that they couldn’t be moved. Dr. Wassell remained with them, knowing that he would be captured by the enemy. But he decided to make a last desperate attempt to get the men out of Java. He asked each of them if he wished to take the chance, and every one agreed.

He first had to get the twelve men to the seacoast—fifty miles away. To do this, he had to improvise stretchers for the hazardous journey. The men were suffering severely, but Dr. Wassell kept them alive by his skill, inspired them by his own courage.

And as the official report said, Dr. Wassell was “almost like a Christ-like shepherd devoted to his flock.”

On the seacoast, he embarked the men on a little Dutch ship. They were bombed, they were machine-gunned by waves of Japanese planes. Dr. Wassell took virtual command of the ship, and by great skill avoided destruction, hiding in little bays and little inlets.

A few days later, Dr. Wassell and his small flock of wounded men reached Australia safely.

And today Dr. Wassell wears the Navy Cross.

Another story concerns a ship, a ship rather than an individual man. You may remember the tragic sinking of the submarine, the United States Ship Squalus, off the New England coast in the summer of 1939. Some of the crew were lost, but others were saved by the speed and the efficiency of the surface rescue crews. The Squalus itself was tediously raised from the bottom of the sea.

She was repaired, put back into commission, and eventually she sailed again under a new name, the United States Ship Sailfish. Today, she is a potent and effective unit of our submarine fleet in the Southwest Pacific.

The Sailfish has covered many thousands of miles in operations in those far waters.

She has sunk a Japanese destroyer.

She has torpedoed a Japanese cruiser.

She has made torpedo hits—two of them—on a Japanese aircraft carrier.

Three of the enlisted men of our Navy who went down with the Squalus in 1939 and were rescued are today serving on the same ship, the United States Ship Sailfish, in this war.

It seems to me that it is heartening to know that the Squalus, once given up as lost, rose from the depths to fight for our country in time of peril.

One more story that I heard only this morning.

This is a story of one of our Army Flying Fortresses operating in the western Pacific. The pilot of this plane is a modest young man, proud of his crew for one of the toughest fights a bomber has yet experienced.
The bomber departed from its base, as part of a flight of five bombers, to attack Japanese transports that were landing troops against us in the Philippines. When they had gone about halfway to their destination, one of the motors of this bomber went out of commission. The young pilot lost contact with the other bombers. The crew, however, got the motor working, got it going again and the plane proceeded on its mission alone.

By the time it arrived at its target the other four Flying Fortresses had already passed over, had dropped their bombs, and had stirred up the hornets’ nest of Japanese “Zero” planes. Eighteen of these Zero fighters attacked our one Flying Fortress. Despite this mass attack, our plane proceeded on its mission, and dropped all of its bombs on six Japanese transports which were lined up along the docks.

As it turned back on its homeward journey a running fight between the bomber and the eighteen Japanese pursuit planes continued for seventy-five miles. Four pursuit planes of the Japs attacked simultaneously at each side. Four were shot down with the side guns. During this fight, the bomber’s radio operator was killed, the engineer’s right hand was shot off, and one gunner was crippled, leaving only one man available to operate both side guns. Although wounded in one hand, this gunner alternately manned both side guns, bringing down three more Japanese Zero planes. While this was going on, one engine on the American bomber was shot out, one gas tank was hit, the radio was shot off, and the oxygen system was entirely destroyed. Out of eleven control cables all but four were shot away. The rear landing wheel was blown off entirely, and the two front wheels were both shot flat.

The fight continued until the remaining Japanese pursuit ships exhausted their ammunition and turned back. With two engines gone and the plane practically out of control, the American bomber returned to its base after dark and made an emergency landing. The mission had been accomplished.

The name of that pilot is Captain Hewitt T. Wheless, of the United States Army. He comes from a place called Menard, Texas—with a population of 2,375. He has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. And I hope that he is listening.

These stories I have told you are not exceptional. They are typical examples of individual heroism and skill.

As we here at home contemplate our own duties, our own responsibilities, let us think and think hard of the example which is being set for us by our fighting men.

Our soldiers and sailors are members of well-disciplined units. But they’re still and forever individuals—free individuals. They are farmers and workers, businessmen, professional men, artists, clerks. They are the United States of America.

That is why they fight.

We too are the United States of America. That is why we must work and sacrifice. It is for them. It is for us. It is for victory.

**Question:**

1. How does FDR seek to involve the entire population in the war effort?
29.4 NAZI SS Officers

Himmler was head of the SS (Schutzstaffel or “Protection Echelon”), the elite militia of the NAZI party used to intimidate and coerce. In the following document, he lays out the SS role and the code of behavior expected of them.


... In 1941 the Führer attacked Russia. That was, as we probably can assert now, shortly—perhaps three to six months—before Stalin was winding up for his great push into Central and Western Europe. I can sketch this first year in a very few lines. The attack cut through. The Russian army was herded together in great pockets, ground down, captured. At that time we did not value this human mass the way we value it today, as raw material, as labor. In the long run, viewed in terms of generations, it is no loss, but today, because of the loss of manpower, it is regrettable that the prisoners died by the tens and hundreds of thousands of exhaustion, of hunger....

GOOD NATURE IN THE WRONG PLACE

It is a basic mistake for us to infuse our inoffensive soul and feeling, our good nature, our idealism, into alien peoples. This has been true since the time of Herder, who must have written Stimmen der Völker in a boozy hour,¹ and who thereby brought such immeasurable sorrow and misery on us later generations. This has been true since the case of the Czechs and Slovenes, to whom, after all, we gave their sense of nationality. They themselves were not capable of achieving it; we invented it for them.

One basic principle must be absolute for the SS man: we must be honest, decent, loyal, and comradely to members of our own blood and to nobody else. What happens to the Russians, what happens to the Czechs, is a matter of total indifference to me. What there is among the nations is the way of good blood of our kind, we will take for ourselves—if necessary, by kidnapping their children and raising them among us. Whether the other nations live in prosperity or croak from hunger interests me only insofar as we need them as slaves for our culture; otherwise, it does not interest me. Whether 10,000 Russian females drop from exhaustion while building an anti-tank ditch interests me only insofar as the anti-tank ditch gets finished for Germany’s sake. We shall never be brutal and heartless where it is not necessary—obviously not. We Germans, the only people in the world who have a decent attitude toward animals, will also take a decent attitude toward these human animals. But it is a crime against our own blood to worry about them and to give them ideals that will make it still harder for our sons and grandsons to cope with them. If someone were to come to me and say, “I cannot build the anti-tank ditch with women or children; it is inhuman, they will die in the process,” then I would have to say, “You are a murderer of your own blood, for if the anti-tank ditch is not built, German soldiers will die, and they are sons of German mothers. They are our own blood.” This is what I want to instill into the SS and what I believe I have instilled into them as one of the most sacred laws of the future: Our concern, our duty is to our people and our blood; it is for them that we have to provide and to plan, to work and to fight, and for nothing else. Toward anything else we can be indifferent. I wish the SS to take this attitude in confronting the problem of all alien, non-Germanic peoples, especially the Russians. All else is just soap bubbles, is a fraud against our own nation and an obstacle to the earlier winning of the war....

FOREIGNERS IN THE REICH

We must also realize that we have between six and seven million foreigners in Germany, perhaps even eight million by now. We have prisoners in Germany. They are none of them dangerous so long as we hit them hard at the smallest trifle. Shooting ten Poles today is a mere nothing when compared with the fact that we might later have to shoot tens of thousands in their place, and that the shooting of these tens of thousands would also cost German blood. Every little fire will immediately be stamped out and quenched and extinguished; others—as with a real conflagration—a political and psychological fire may break out among the people.

¹ Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803), German philosopher and poet, has been called the father of German nationalism. As a champion of the idea of nationalism, he published an anthology of folk songs of various peoples called Stimmen der Völker (Voices of the Peoples).
THE COMMUNISTS IN THE REICH

I do not believe the Communists could risk any action, for their leading elements, like most criminals, are in our concentration camps. Here something needs saying: After the war it will be possible to see what a blessing it was for Germany that, regardless of all humanitarian sentimentality, we imprisoned this whole criminal substratum of the German people in the concentration camps; and for this I claim the credit. If these people were going about free, we would be having a harder time of it. For then the subhumans would have their NCO’s and commanding officers, they would have their workers’ and soldiers’ councils. As it is, they are locked up, and are making shells or projectile cases or other important things, and are very useful members of human society....

THE EVACUATION OF THE JEWS

I also want to make reference before you here, in complete frankness, to a really grave matter. Among ourselves, this once, it shall be uttered quite frankly; but in public we will never speak of it. Just as we did not hesitate on June 30, 1934, to do our duty as ordered, to stand up against the wall comrades who had transgressed, and shoot them,² so we have never talked about this and never will. It was the tact which I am glad to say is a matter of course to us that made us never discuss it among ourselves, never talk about it. Each of us shuddered, and yet each one knew that he would do it again if it were ordered and if it were necessary.

I am referring to the evacuation of the Jews, the annihilation of the Jewish people. This is one of those things that are easily said. “The Jewish people is going to be annihilated,” says every party member. “Sure, it’s in our program, elimination of the Jews, annihilation—we’ll take care of it.” And then they all come trudging, 80 million worthy Germans, and each one has his own decent Jew. Sure, the others are swine, but this one is an A-1 Jew. Of all those who talk this way, not one has seen it happen, not one has been through it. Most of you must know what it means to see a hundred corpses lie side by side, or five hundred, or a thousand. To have stuck this out and—excepting cases of human weakness—to have kept our integrity, that is what has made us hard. In our history, this is an unwritten and never-to-be-written page of glory, for we know how difficult we would have made it for ourselves if today—amid the bombing raids, the hardships and the deprivations of war—we still had the Jews in every city as secret saboteurs, agitators, and demagogues. If the Jews were still ensconced in the body of the German nation, we probably would have reached the 1916-17 stage by now.³

The wealth they had we have taken from them. I have issued a strict order, Carried out by SS-Obergruppenführer Pohl, that this wealth in its entirety is to be turned over to the Reich as a matter of course. We have taken none of it for ourselves. Individuals who transgress will be punished in accordance with an order I issued at the beginning, threatening that whoever takes so much as a mark of it for himself is a dead man. A number of SS men—not very many—have transgressed, and they will die, without mercy. We had the moral right, we had the duty toward our people, to kill this people which wanted to kill us. But we do not have the right to enrich ourselves with so much as a fur, a watch, a mark, or a cigarette or anything else. Having exterminated a germ, we do not want, in the end, to be infected by the germ, and die of it. I will not stand by and let even a small rotten spot develop or take hold. Wherever it may form, we together will cauterize it. All in all, however, we can say that we have carried out this heaviest of our tasks in a spirit of love for our people. And our inward being, our soul, or character has not suffered injury from it.

Questions:
1. How does Himmler characterize the Germans, non-Germans, Jews, and communists?
2. How does he justify the differences?
3. What is the role of the SS?
4. Compare the attitudes of Nagatomo and Himmler. What are the similarities and differences?

² A reference to the purge of the SA [Sturmabteilung, “storm troopers,” the Nazi Party militia] and the murder of its top leaders by SS officers and men.
³ The reference is to the time when the tide of World War I began to turn against Germany. German nationalists and rightists then attributed Germany’s losses and ultimate defeat to the Dolchstoss, the “stab in the back” by the Jews.
29.5 The Buchenwald Report

The first selection below is from The Buchenwald Report, the transcriptions of interviews of prisoners at the Buchenwald concentration camp at the time of its liberation in 1945. The second document is a short excerpt from the daily record compiled by Emmanuel Ringelblum about life in the Warsaw Ghetto. Half million Jews were forced to live under increasingly harsh conditions in a 100 square block walled area for three years until they were “ground to death” or taken to extermination camps. The Ghetto was burnt to the ground after an amazing, defiant revolt by its remaining inmates. Ringelblum escaped the Ghetto, but he was captured working in the resistance and executed in 1944.

The stone quarry at Mauthausen, named the “Viennese Trench” was fenced in on only three sides to save on sentries. On the open side was a trench 60 to 75 feet deep. In the fence was a gate, the so-called death’s gate, through which prisoners were chased over the sentry line and mowed down one after another with machine gun fire. In 1941 a transport of about 400 Dutch Jewish prisoners came from Buchenwald concentration camp to Mauthausen. The transport arrived around midnight. The Mauthausen prisoners were not allowed to leave the barracks; fifty of the arriving Jews were driven naked from the bath into the camp and chased into the electric fence. All the others went into a block.

A political prisoner, George Glas of Landshut, was the clerk in this block. The first deputy commandant (he came from Dingolfing in Lower Bavaria) and the second deputy commandant, Ernstberger, declared to the prisoner clerk that the block had to be empty in at most six weeks. The clerk answered that he wanted to have nothing to do with such things and would rather resign from his post than attack prisoners in any way. He was immediately dismissed, received twenty-five—perhaps even thirty-five—lashes on the buttocks and back with a cane, and was transferred into the sock-darning work detail, which was essentially designated for liquidation by injection, “according to need.” It was possible to save the comrade by transferring him to another camp. A “green” (professional criminal) replaced Glas as block clerk.

On the second day after their arrival, the Jews were chased to “work” in the stone quarry. They were not allowed to go down the 148 steps that led to the bottom of the quarry but had to slide down the sloping sides on stone rubble, which already killed or very seriously injured many. Boards to carry stone were then laid over their shoulders, and two other prisoners were forced to hoist an extremely heavy stone onto the Jews’ boards. Then the prisoners went up the 148 steps at caracho [double time], these heavy stones on their shoulder boards. At times the stones fell straight back, so that some prisoners had their feet chopped off or suffered other severe injuries. If a Jew’s stone fell down, he was beaten horribly and the stone loaded on again. There were tortures, tortures that cannot even be described. Already on the first day of “work” many Jews chose suicide out of despair, plunging from the top into the 80-foot-deep hole, to remain lying there, crushed.

On the third day the “death’s gate” was opened. Terrible beatings of Jewish prisoners began, and they were driven over the sentry line to be shot down into piles by tower guards with machine guns. Already by the next day Jews no longer jumped into the depths individually: They joined hands, and the first one pulled behind him nine to twelve comrades into a horrible death. It took not four but scarcely three weeks before the block was empty. All 600 prisoners met their deaths through shootings, beatings, and other tortures or through suicide.

It should also be mentioned that civilian employees of the Mauthausen stone quarry requested that death by jumping be prevented because the scraps of flesh and brains that stuck to the rocks offered a gruesome sight. Then the stone quarry was “cleaned” with water hoses, and prisoner guards were stationed to keep prisoners from jumping. The remaining Jewish prisoners were beaten over the sentry line and into death. When new transports of Jewish prisoners arrived, the SS joked about it, saying that a new “battalion of paratroopers” had arrived.

Adam Kuszinsky, Poland
Ludwig Neumeter, Germany

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 29.5 and 29.6.
1. What do these accounts reveal about life for Jews under the Nazis?
2. What were the relationships between the different type of prisoners? between the German guards and the inmates?
3. What signs of defiance despite their oppressed condition can be found in these accounts?
29.6 Notes from the Warsaw Ghetto

The first selection below is from The Buchenwald Report, the transcriptions of interviews of prisoners at the Buchenwald concentration camp at the time of its liberation in 1945. The second document is a short excerpt from the daily record compiled by Emmanuel Ringelblum about life in the Warsaw Ghetto. Half million Jews were forced to live under increasingly harsh conditions in a 100 square block walled area for three years until they were “ground to death” or taken to extermination camps. The Ghetto was burnt to the ground after an amazing, defiant revolt by its remaining inmates. Ringelblum escaped the Ghetto, but he was captured working in the resistance and executed in 1944.


The end of April and beginning of May [1942] we lived in terror of deportation. Where this rumor emanated from no one knows. One opinion has it that the Polish merchants spread the rumor in order to persuade the Jewish populace to sell their possessions. There was even some talk of the number of deportees being from 150,000 to 200,000, the country of destination Rumania. There were rumors emanating from the Kitchen Department of the Jewish Council that “nonproductive” elements would be deported, and only workers would be able to enjoy the benefits of the kitchen. This was regarded as a grave omen. However, Council circles have assured us that the danger of deportation that has been hanging over our heads has been avoided, thanks to the presence of factories in the Ghetto that are supplying the needs of the German Army. This is a tragic paradox. Only those Jews have the right to live who work to supply the German Army. The same was true in Vilna, Rowne, and dozens of other cities where there were mass slaughters of Jews. The only Jews left alive were those who directly or indirectly worked for the Germans. Never in history has there been a national tragedy of these dimensions. A people that hates the Germans with every fiber of its being can purchase its life only at the price of helping its foe to victory—the very victory that means the complete annihilation of Jewry from the face of Europe, if not of the whole world.

The Warsaw Ghetto is hard at work for the Germans. They’re repairing clothing stripped from soldiers killed in battle, and are beginning to prepare such winter items as quilted trousers, vests, and overcoats. Also straw shoes, furniture, etc. The center of all this activity is the firm of Toebbens at 12 Prosta Street, where more than 1,000 workers are busy. It’s typical that in the waiting room outside the office of Bauch, the man in charge of work, a number of pointed rods of various size and thickness hang. These, it would seem, are implements that no German can get along without. They’re the symbols of bloodthirsty Hitlerism that one finds everywhere—in concentration camps, in work camps, in prison, and even at places of work.

... Two days ago (May 5-6) a characteristic smuggling incident took place. The corner house at 21 Franciszkanska Street that is next to the Wall is a hotbed of smuggling. A ladder is thrown over the Wall and smuggling goes on all night. But this night the smugglers quarrel among themselves, and one of them informs where it will do the most good. The police come at once and catch a whole crowd in the middle of operations. Machine guns begin shooting, one smuggler is shot dead on the spot, one or two others wounded. Then they search every apartment in the building, take away a great deal of goods, and arrest forty smugglers. For 40,000 zlotys, they return the goods and set the smugglers free. That is the sum that the police claim to have lost because the smugglers used the Wall to bring goods in, rather than taking them through the watch at the Ghetto gate, where the police get a cut. Most of the smuggling goes through the watch. It costs 100 zlotys per wagon. The driver has to know the password, or else he can’t get through.

There are policemen who make 2,000 zlotys in an hour or two. The smuggling of goods past the Wall continues, resulting every day in the sacrifice of a large number of wounded and dead. Often minors and children are among the victims. There is one policeman who is renowned as a model German. Nicknamed “the gentleman,” he is the soul of honesty. He permits wagons through the gates of the Wall, refusing to take a bribe. He also permits Jewish children to pass to the Other Side by the dozen to buy food, for the most part potatoes and other vegetables. Examples of his wondrous decency and honesty are recounted daily. He plays all sorts of games with the smuggler children. He lines them up, commands them to sing, and marches them through the gates.

... They tell this story: Churchill invited the Chassidic rabbi of Ger to come to see and advise him how to bring about Germany’s downfall. The rabbi gave the following reply: “There are two possible ways, one involving natural means, the other supernatural. The natural means would be if a million angels with flaming swords were to descend on Germany and destroy it. The supernatural would be if a million Englishmen parachuted down on Germany and destroyed it.”

They are now filming the Ghetto. They spent two days shooting the Jewish prison and the Council. They drove a crowd of Jews together on Smocza Street, then ordered the Jewish policemen to disperse them. At another place they shot a scene showing a Jewish policeman about to beat a Jew when a German comes along and saves the fallen Jew.
There is a big sign in German in the cemetery ordering Germans not to visit the Jewish graveyard. Supposedly, the grounds for this ban are sanitation, but in actual fact, the reason is quite different. Crowds of Germans used to visit the cemetery to stare at the famous shed where daily the skeletons of the corpses of poor people who had starved to death in the street were heaped-candidates for mass graves....

The German Jews, deported here from Hanover, Berlin, etc., have brought a number of jokes with them. One of them is that they explain the emblem Jude [Jew] that they have to wear on their chest as being the initials of the words: Italiens Und Deutschlands Ende [The end of Italy and Germany]. Despite all they went through in Germany, they still talk about “unser Fuehrer” [“our leader Hitler”] and still believe in German victory. They are certain, despite everything, that they will return to Germany. Although it has been some time since they came to Warsaw (more than a month), they are still kept separate from the rest of the Jews. They live outside the Ghetto in special quarantine quarters. Some three hundred of them work in various outside work details. They have to wear the Jude emblem even when they secure permission to live in the Ghetto. The first thing they touched upon was the question of work. They were all working in Germany. The old folks can’t get used to the new situation. The result is they’re dying in large numbers. They’re treated much better than the other refugees. There simply is no comparison between the way the Jewish Council treats the Polish refugees and its attitude to the German Jews. The latter get a quarter of a kilo of bread, soup, coffee [daily]. True, that’s much worse than what they got in Germany, but compared with the usual conditions in the Ghetto, it’s paradise. Demoralization is spreading rapidly through the Ghetto. While the poor become ever poorer and dress in rags, the girls are dressing up as though the war were nonexistent. There have been many cases of girls stealing from their parents, taking things from home to sell or barter for ornaments, or a hair wave—in a word, for luxury items.

In April or March Jews were forbidden to use German marks that bore the likeness of H. [Hitler]. Apparently they’re afraid Jews might give him the Evil Eye!

Jonas Turkow acted this season in a Polish repertoire. The reason: There are no good plays in Yiddish. Besides, this is evidence of the marked assimilation so discernible in the Ghetto. The Jews love to speak Polish. There is very little Yiddish heard in the streets. We have had some heated discussions on this question. One explanation advanced is that speaking Polish is a psychological protest against the Ghetto—you have thrown us into a Jewish Ghetto, but we’ll show you that it really is a Polish street. To spite you, we’ll hold on to the very thing you are trying to separate us from—the Polish language and the culture it represents. But my personal opinion is that what we see in the Ghetto today is only a continuation of the powerful linguistic assimilation that was marked even before the war and has become more noticeable in the Ghetto. So long as Warsaw was mixed, with Jews and Poles living side by side, one did not notice it so acutely; but now that the streets are completely Jewish, the extent of this calamity forces itself upon one’s attention.

Questions:
The following questions pertain to documents 29.5 and 29.6.
1. What do these accounts reveal about life for Jews under the Nazis?
2. What were the relationships between the different type of prisoners? between the German guards and the inmates?
3. What signs of defiance despite their oppressed condition can be found in these accounts?
Shukhov noticed there was a little mortar left in Kilgas’s hod. He didn’t want to waste it, but was worried that the squad leader might be reprimanded if the trowels were handed in late.

“Listen, men,” he said, “give your trowels to Gopchik. Mine’s not on the list. So I won’t have to hand it in. I’ll keep going.”

Tiurin said with a laugh: “How can we ever let you out? We just can’t do without you.”

Shukhov laughed too, and went on working.

Kilgas took the trowels. Senka went on handing blocks to Shukhov. They poured Kilgas’s mortar into Shukhov’s hod.

Gopchik ran across to the tool store, to overtake Pavlo. The rest were just as anxious to be in time, and hurried over to the gates, without Tiurin. A squad leader is a power, but the escort is a greater power still. They list latecomers, and that means the guardhouse for you.

There was a terrible crowd near the gates now. Everyone had collected there. It looked as if the escort had come out and started counting.

(They counted the prisoners twice on the way out: once before they unbolted the gates, to make sure they were safe in opening them, and again when the gates had been opened and the prisoners were passing through. And if they thought they’d miscounted, they recounted outside the gates.)

“To hell with the mortar,” said Tiurin, with a gesture of impatience. “Sling it over the wall.”

“Don’t wait, leader. Go ahead, you’re needed there. (Shukhov usually addressed Tiurin, more respectfully, as Andrei Prokofievich, but now, after working like that, he felt equal to the squad leader. He didn’t put it to himself, “Look, I’m your equal,” he just knew it.) And as Tiurin strode down the ramp he called after him, jokingly: “Why do these bastards make the work day so short? We were just getting into our stride when they call it off.”

Shukhov was left alone now with Senka. You couldn’t say much to him. Besides, you didn’t have to tell him things: he was the wisest of them all; he understood without need of words.

Slap on the mortar. Down with the block. Press it home. See it’s straight. Mortar. Block. Mortar. Block....

Wasn’t it enough that Tiurin had told them himself not to bother about the mortar? Just throw it over the wall and fuck off. But Shukhov wasn’t made that way—eight years in a camp couldn’t change his nature. He worried about anything he could make use of, about every scrap of work he could do—nothing must be wasted without good reason.

Mortar. Block. Mortar. Block....

“Finish, fuck you,” shouted Senka. “Let’s get out of here.”

He picked up a barrow and ran down the ramp.

But Shukhov—and if the guards had put the dogs on him it would have made no difference—ran to the back and looked about. Not bad. Then he ran and gave the wall a good look over, to the left, to the right. His eye was as accurate as a carpenter’s level. Straight and even. His hands were as young as ever.

He dashed down the ramp.

Senka was already out of the machine shop and running down the slope.

“Come on, come on.” he shouted over his shoulder.

“Run ahead. I’ll catch up,” Shukhov gestured.

But he went into the machine shop. He couldn’t simply throw his trowel down. He might not be there the next day. They might send the squad off to the Socialist Way of Life settlement. It could be six months before he returned to the power station. But did that mean he was to throw down his trowel? If he’d swiped it he had to hang on to it.

Both the stoves had been doused. It was dark, frightening. Frightening not because it was dark but because everyone had left, because he alone might be missing at the count by the gates, and the guards would beat him.
Yet his eyes darted here, darted there, and, spotting a big stone in the corner, he pulled it aside, slipped his trowel under it, and hid it. So that’s that.

Now to catch up with Senka. Senka had stopped after running a hundred paces or so. Senka would never leave anyone in a jam. Pay for it? Then together.

They ran neck and neck, the tall and the short. Senka was a head taller than Shukhov, and a big head it was too. There are loafers who race one another of their own free will around a stadium. Those devils should be running after a full day’s work, with aching back and wet mittens and worn-out valenki—and in the cold too.

They panted like mad dogs. All you could hear was their hoarse breathing.

Well, Tiurin was at the gates. He’d explain.

They were running straight into the crowd. It scared you.

Hundreds of throats booing you at once, and cursing you up and down. Wouldn’t you be scared if you had five hundred men blowing their tops at you?

But what about the guards? That was the chief thing.

No. No trouble with them. Tiurin was there, in the last row. He must have explained. Taken the blame on his own shoulders.

But the men yelled, the men swore. And what swearing! Even Senka couldn’t help hearing and, drawing a deep breath, gave back as good as he got. He’d kept quiet all his life—but now, how he bellowed! Raised his fists too, ready to pick a fight right away. The men fell silent. Someone laughed.

“Hey, one hundred and fourth,” same a shout. “Your deaf guy’s a fake. We just tested him.”

Everyone laughed. The guards too.

“Form fives.”

They didn’t open the gates. They didn’t trust themselves. They pushed the crowd back from the gates (everyone stuck to the gates like idiots—as if they’d get out quicker that way!).

“Form fives. First. Second. Third...”

Each five, as it was called, took a few paces forward.

... ... ...

“Turn around, you slob,” a guard shouted. “Get in line.”

The count had almost reached them. The twelfth five of the fifth hundred had moved ahead, leaving only Buinovsky and Shukhov at the back.

The escort was worried. There was a discussion over the counting boards. Somebody missing. Again somebody missing. Why the hell can’t they learn to count?

They’d counted 462. Ought to be 463.

Once more they pushed everybody back from the gates (the zeks had crowded forward again).

“Form fives. First. Second. Third...”

What made this recounting so infuriating was that the time wasted on it was the zek’s own, not the authorities’. They would still have to cross the steppe, get to the camp, and line up there to be searched. The columns would come in from all sides on the double, trying to be first at the frisking and into the camp. The column that was back first was top dog in the camp that evening—the mess hall was theirs, they were first in line to get their packages, first at the private kitchen, first at the C.E.D. to pick up letters or hand in their own to be censored, first at the dispensary, the barber’s, the baths—first everywhere.

And the escort too is in a hurry to get the zeks in and be off for the night. A soldier’s life isn’t much fun either—a lot of work, little time.

And now the count had come out wrong.

As the last few fives were called forward Shukhov began to hope that there were going to be three in the last row after all. No, damn it, two again.

The tellers went to the head guard with their tally boards. There was a consultation. The head guard shouted:

“Squad leader of the hundred and fourth.”

Tiurin took half a pace forward. “Here.”

“Did you leave anyone behind in the power station? Think.”

“No.”

“Think again. I’ll knock your head off....”

“No, I’m quite sure.”

But he stole a glance at Pavlov. Could anyone have dropped off to sleep in the machine shop?

“Form squads,” the head guard shouted.
They had formed the groups of five just as they happened to be standing. Now they began to shift about. Voices boomed out: “Seventy-fifth over here,” “This way, thirteenth,” “Thirty-second here.”

The 104th, being all in the rear, formed there too. They were empty-handed to a man, Shukhov noticed; like idiots, they’d worked on so late they’d collected no firewood. Only two of them were carrying small bundles.

This game was played every evening: before the job was over the workers would gather chips, sticks, and broken laths, and tie them together with bits of string or ragged tapes to carry back with them. The first raid on their bundles would take place near the gates to the work site. If either the superintendent or one of the foremen was standing there, he’d order the prisoners to throw down their firewood (millions of rubles had gone up in smoke, yet there they were thinking they’d make up the losses with kindling). But a zek calculated his own way: if everyone brought even a few sticks back with him the barracks would be warmer. Barrack orderlies were issued ten pounds of coaldust a stove and little heat could be squeezed out of that. So the men would break up sticks or saw them short and slip them under their coats.

The escort never made the zeks drop their firewood at the gates to the work site. For one thing, it would have been an offense to the uniform; and secondly they had their hands on machine guns, ready to shoot. But just before entering the zone several ranks in the column were ordered to throw their stuff down. The escort, however, robbed mercifully—they had to leave something for the guards, and for the zeks themselves, who otherwise wouldn’t bring any with them.

So every zek brought some firewood along with him every evening. You never knew when you might get it through or when they’d grab it.

While Shukhov was scouring the ground in search of a few chips, Tiurin had finished counting the squad.

“One hundred and fourth all present,” he reported to the head guard.

“Odd that anyone could work so hard as to ignore the signal to knock off.

He completely forgot that he’d been working like that himself only an hour ago—that he’d been annoyed with the others for assembling at the gate too early. Now he was chilled to the bone and his fury mounted with everyone else’s; were they to be kept waiting another half hour by that Moldavian? If the guards handed him over to the zeks they’d tear him apart, like wolves with a lamb.

Yes, the cold was coming into its own now. No one stood quiet. They either stamped their feet where they stood or walked two or three paces back and forth.

People were discussing whether the Moldavian could have escaped. Well, if he’d fled during the day that was one thing, but if he’d hidden and was simply waiting for the sentries to go off the watchtowers he hadn’t a chance. Unless he’d left a trail through the wire the sentries wouldn’t be allowed back in camp for at least three days. They’d have to go on manning the towers for a week, if necessary. That was in the regulations, as the oldtimers knew. In short, if someone escaped, the guards had had it; they were hounded, without sleep or food. Sometimes they were roused to such fury that the runaway wouldn’t get back alive.

Three small figures were bursting out of the repair shop. So they’d found the Moldavian.

“Boooo!” went the crowd at the gates.

And they yelled, as the group drew nearer: “Bastard! Shit! Idiot! Cow’s twat! Lousy son-of-a-bitch!”

And Shukhov joined in: “Rat!”

It’s no joke to rob five hundred men of over half an hour.

The head of the escort shouted: “Back from the gates. Form fives.”

Another recount, the dogs. Why should they count us now that everything’s clear? The prisoners began to boo. All their anger switched from the Moldavian to the escort. They booed and didn’t move.

“W-what?” shouted the head of the escort. “Want to sit down on the snow? All right, I’ll have you down in a minute I’ll keep you here till dawn.”

He was quite capable of doing it, too. He’d had them on the snow many a time. “Down on your faces!” And, to the escort: “Release safety-catches!” The zeks knew all about that. They drew back from the gates.
Shukhov had the feeling that there were going to be four. He was numb with fear. One extra. Another recount. But it turned out that Fetiukov, after cadging a butt from the captain, had been wandering around and had failed to get into his five in time. So now he’d turned up in the back row as if he were an extra.

A guard struck Fetiukov angrily on the back of the neck.
Serve him right.

So they counted three in the back row. The count had come out right, thank God.
“Back from the gates,” shouted a guard at the top of his voice. But this time the zeks didn’t mutter—they’d noticed soldiers coming out of the gatehouse and forming a cordon on the other side of the gates.
So they were going to be let out.
None of the foremen was in sight, nor the superintendent, so the prisoners kept their firewood. [Though many would be forced to drop it before they got to the barracks that night.]

Questions:
1. What was life like in the camp, for the prisoners, for the guards?
2. What were the interactions between the men like? What was at stake?
3. How did people survive these horrible conditions?
PART 30
The Cold War and its Aftermath

30.1 Nikita S. Khrushchev: Address to the Twentieth Party Congress

Nikita S. Khrushchev (1894–1971) took over as first party secretary of the Soviet Union following the death of Joseph Stalin (1879–1953) in 1953. At the 20th Party Congress, he delivered a secret speech denouncing the brutal excesses of Stalin’s regime. Under Khrushchev’s direction, the Soviet Union began a process of “destalinization.”


When we analyze the practice of Stalin in regard to the direction of the party and of the country, when we pause to consider everything which Stalin perpetrated, we must be convinced that Lenin’s fears were justified. The negative characteristics of Stalin, which, in Lenin’s time, were only incipient, transformed themselves during the last years into a grave abuse of power by Stalin, which caused untold harm to our party.

We have to consider seriously and analyze correctly this matter in order that we may preclude any possibility of a repetition in any form whatever of what took place during the life of Stalin, who absolutely did not tolerate collegiality in leadership and in work, and who practiced brutal violence, not only toward everything which opposed him, but also toward that which seemed to his capricious and despotic character, contrary to his concepts.

Stalin acted not through persuasion, explanation, and patient cooperation with people, but by imposing his concepts and demanding absolute submission to his opinion. Whoever opposed this concept or tried to prove his viewpoint, and the correctness of his position—was doomed to removal from the leading collective and to subsequent moral and physical annihilation. This was especially true during the period following the 17th party congress, when many prominent party leaders and rank-and-file party workers, honest and dedicated to the cause of communism, fell victim to Stalin’s despotism. . . .

Lenin’s traits—patient work with people; stubborn and painstaking education of them; the ability to induce people to follow him without using compulsion, but rather through the ideological influence on them of the whole collective—were entirely foreign to Stalin. He (Stalin) discarded the Leninist method of convincing and educating; he abandoned the method of ideological struggle for that of administrative violence, mass repressions, and terror. He acted on an increasingly larger scale and more stubbornly through punitive organs, at the same time often violating all existing norms of morality and of Soviet laws. . . .

During Lenin’s life party congresses were convened regularly; always when a radical turn in the development of the party and the country took place Lenin considered it absolutely necessary that the party discuss at length all the basic matters pertaining to internal and foreign policy and to questions bearing on the development of party and government. . . .

Were our party’s holy Leninist principles observed after the death of Vladimir Ilyich? Whereas during the first few years after Lenin’s death party congresses and central committee plenums took place more or less regularly; later, when Stalin began increasingly to abuse his power, these principles were brutally violated. This was especially evident during the last 15 years of his life. Was it a normal situation when 13 years elapsed between the 18th and 19th party congresses, years during which our party and our country had experienced so many important events? These events demanded categorically that the party should have passed resolutions pertaining to the country’s defense during the patriotic war and to peacetime construction after the war. Even after the end of the war a congress was not convened for over 7 years.

Central committee plenums were hardly ever called. It should be sufficient to mention that during all the years of the patriotic war not a single central committee plenum took place. . . .

In practice Stalin ignored the norms of party life and trampled on the Leninist principle of collective party leadership. . . .

Facts prove that many abuses were made on Stalin’s orders without reckoning with any norms of party and Soviet legality. Stalin was a very distrustful man. . . . He could look at a man and say: “Why are your eyes so shifty today,” or “Why are you turning so much today and avoiding to look me directly in the eyes?” The sickly suspicion created in him a general distrust even toward eminent party workers whom he had known for years. Everywhere and in everything he saw enemies, “two-facers” and spies.

Possessing unlimited power he indulged in great willfulness and choked a person morally and physically. A situation was created where one could not express one’s own will. . . .
The willfulness of Stalin showed itself not only in decisions concerning the internal life of the country but also in the international relations of the Soviet Union.

The July plenum of the Central Committee studied in detail the reasons for the development of conflict with Yugoslavia. It was a shameful role which Stalin played here. The “Yugoslav affair” contained no problems which could not have been solved through party discussions among comrades. There was no significant basis for the development of this affair; it was completely possible to have prevented the rupture of relations with that country. This does not mean, however, that the Yugoslav leaders did not make mistakes or did not have shortcomings. But these mistakes and shortcomings were magnified in a monstrous manner by Stalin, which resulted in a break of relations with a friendly country.

I recall the first days when the conflict between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia began artificially to be blown up. Once, when I came from Kiev to Moscow, I was invited to visit Stalin who, pointing to the copy of a letter lately sent to Tito, asked me, “Have you read this?”

Not waiting for my reply he answered, “I will shake my little finger and there will be no more Tito. He will fall.”

We have dearly paid for this “shaking of the little finger.” This statement reflected Stalin’s mania for greatness, but he acted just that way: “I shall shake my little finger and there will be no Kossior”; “I will shake my little finger once more and Postyshev and Chubar will be no more”; “I will shake my little finger again and Voznesensky, Kuznetsov and many others will disappear.”

But this did not happen to Tito. No matter how much or how little Stalin shook, not only his little finger but everything else that he could shake, Tito did not fall. Why? The reason was that, in this case of disagreement with the Yugoslav comrades, Tito had behind him a state and a people who had gone through a severe school of fighting for liberty and independence, a people which gave support to its leaders.

You see to what Stalin’s mania for greatness led. He had completely lost consciousness of reality; he demonstrated his suspicion and haughtiness not only in relation to individuals in the U.S.S.R., but in relation to whole parties and nations.

We have carefully examined the case of Yugoslavia and have found a proper solution which is approved by the peoples of the Soviet Union and of Yugoslavia as well as by the working masses of all the people’s democracies and by all progressive humanity. The liquidation of the abnormal relationship with Yugoslavia was done in the interest of the whole camp of socialism, in the interest of strengthening peace in the whole world....

If we are to consider this matter as Marxists and as Leninists, then we have to state unequivocally that the leadership practice which came into being during the last years of Stalin’s life became a serious obstacle in the path of Soviet social development.

Stalin often failed for months to take up some unusually important problems concerning the life of the party and of the state whose solution could not be postponed. During Stalin’s leadership our peaceful relations with other nations were often threatened, because one-man decisions could cause and often did cause great complications.

In the last years, when we managed to free ourselves of the harmful practice of the cult of the individual and took several proper steps in the sphere of internal and external policies, everyone saw how activity grew before their very eyes, how the creative activity of the broad working masses developed, how favorably all this acted upon the development of economy and of culture. [Applause.]

Some comrades may ask us: Where were the members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee? Why did they not assert themselves against the cult of the individual in time? And why is this being done only now?

First of all we have to consider the fact that the members of the Political Bureau viewed these matters in a different way at different times. Initially, many of them backed Stalin actively because Stalin was one of the strongest Marxists and his logic, his strength, and his will greatly influenced the cadres and party work. . . .

Later, however, abusing his power more and more, [Stalin] began to fight eminent party and government leaders and to use terroristic methods against honest Soviet people. . . .

It is clear that such conditions put every member of the Political Bureau in a very difficult situation. And when we also consider the fact that in the last years the Central Committee plenary sessions were not convened, and that the sessions of the Political Bureau occurred only occasionally, from time to time, then we will understand how difficult it was for any member of the Political Bureau to take a stand against one or another unjust or improper procedure, against serious errors and shortcomings in the practices of leadership. . . .

Comrades, we must abolish the cult of the individual decisively, once and for all; we must draw the proper conclusions concerning both ideological-theoretical and practical work.
It is necessary for this purpose:

First, in a Bolshevik manner to condemn and to eradicate the cult of the individual as alien to Marxism-Leninism and not consonant with the principles of party leadership and the norms of party life, and to fight inexorably all attempts at bringing back this practice.

Secondly, to continue systematically and consistently the work done by the party's central committee during the last years, a work characterized by minute observation in all party organizations, from the bottom to the top, of the Leninist principles of party leadership, characterized, above all, by the main principle of collective leadership, characterized by the observation of the norms of party life described in the statutes of our party, and, finally, characterized by the wide practice of criticism and self-criticism.

Thirdly, to restore completely the Leninist principles of Soviet Socialist democracy, expressed in the constitution of the Soviet Union, to fight willfulness of individuals abusing their power. The evil caused by acts violating revolutionary Socialist legality which have accumulated during a long time as a result of the negative influence of the cult of the individual has to be completely corrected.

We are absolutely certain that our party, armed with the historical resolutions of the 20th Congress, will lead the Soviet people along the Leninist path to new successes, to new victories. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause.]

Long live the victorious banner of our party—Leninism. [Tumultuous, prolonged applause ending in ovation. All rise.]

Question:
1. What steps did Khrushchev propose to eradicate the “cult of the individual” in the Soviet Union?
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30.2 George Kennan, from Memoirs: 1925–1950

George Kennan (1904 – ) is one of the foremost diplomatic historians of the twentieth century. He has served as U.S. ambassador to the Soviet Union and to Yugoslavia and was a member of Princeton’s Institute for Advanced Study. In the selection included below, Kennan provided guidelines for U.S.-Soviet relations.


Historically, the foreign affairs of Russia have developed along lines entirely different from those of the United States. Our most important foreign relations, historically speaking, have been along the lines of peaceable overseas trade. These have set the pattern of our thinking on foreign affairs. The Russians, throughout their history, have dealt principally with fierce hostile neighbors. Lacking natural geographical barriers, they have had to develop, in order to deal with these neighbors, a peculiar technique (now become traditional and almost automatic) of elastic advance and retreat, of defense in depth, of secretiveness, of wariness, of deceit. Their history has known many armistices between hostile forces; but it has never known an example of the permanent peaceful coexistence of two neighboring states with established borders accepted without question by both peoples. The Russians therefore have no conception of permanent friendly relations between States. For them, all foreigners are potential enemies. The technique of Russian diplomacy, like that of the Orient in general, is concentrated on impressing an adversary with the terrifying strength of Russian power, while keeping him uncertain and confused as to the exact channels and means of its application and thus inducing him to treat all Russian wishes and views with particular respect and consideration. It has nothing to do with the cultivation of friendly relations as we conceive them.

We would find it much easier to deal with Russia if we would recognize frankly in our own minds the fact that its leaders are, by their own choice, the enemies of all that part of the world they do not control, and that this is a recognized principle of thought and action for the entire Soviet machine. Let us also remember that in the Soviet Union decisions are rarely taken by individuals. They are taken by collective bodies. These collective bodies are required to proceed on the theory that the outside world is hostile to Russia and would be incapable of a generous or unselfish act toward the Russian state or people. It follows from this that no act of a foreign government could be officially recognized as an act of good will. Any Soviet official who would dispute this principle and try to demonstrate in a Soviet body that a foreign state had gone out of its way to be nice to the Soviet Union and deserved credit for it would risk—at the least—his job. Everyone in the Soviet government must assume that foreign governments act only in their own interests, and that gratitude and appreciation are unknown qualities in foreign affairs.

In this Way, the machinery by which Soviet foreign affairs are conducted is capable of recognizing, and reacting to, only considerations of concrete Soviet interest. No one can argue any proposition in the councils of the Soviet government unless he can show concretely how the interests of the Soviet Union stand to gain if it is accepted or to suffer if it is rejected. This principle is applied with the most serene objectivity. In examining a position taken by a foreign state, the Russians make no effort to look at it from the standpoint of the foreign state in question or from any fancied community of aims on the part of themselves and the state involved. They assume it is dictated by purposes which are not theirs, and they examine it only from the standpoint of its effect on them. If the effect is favorable, they accept it without gratitude; if it is unfavorable, they reject it without resentment. We could make it much easier for them and for ourselves if we would face these facts.

In the light of the above, I would like to suggest the following rules to govern our dealings with the Russians:

A. **Don’t act chummy with them.**

This only embarrasses them individually, and deepens their suspicions. Russian officials abhor the thought of appearing before their own people as one who has become buddies with a foreigner. This is not their idea of good relations.

B. **Don’t assume a community of aims with them which does not really exist.**

There is no use trying to swing Russians into line by referring to common purposes to which we may both have done lip service at one time or another, such as the strengthening of world peace, or democracy, or what you will. They had their own purposes when they did lip service to these purposes. They think we had ours. For them it’s all a game. And when we try to come at them with arguments based on such common professions, they become doubly wary.
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C. Don’t make fatuous gestures of good will.
   Few of us have any idea how much perplexity and suspicion has been caused in the Soviet mind by gestures and concessions granted by well-meaning Americans with a view to convincing the Russians of their friendly sentiments. Such acts upset all their calculations and throw them way off balance. They immediately begin to expect that they have overestimated our strength, that they have been remiss in their obligations to the Soviet state, that they should have been demanding more from us all along. Frequently, this has exactly the opposite effect from that which we are seeking.

D. Make no requests of the Russians unless we are prepared to make them feel our displeasure in a practical way in case the request is not granted.
   We should be prepared as a matter of principle to accompany every expression of our wishes by some action on our part proving that Russian interests suffer if our wishes are not observed. This requires imagination, firmness, and coordination of policy. If we cannot find these qualities in our foreign affairs, then we should begin to prepare for serious trouble.

E. Take up matters on a normal level and insist that Russians take full responsibility for their actions on that level.
   Requests should not, as a rule, be taken to higher levels just because we have failed to get satisfaction on a lower level. This merely encourages the Russian bureaucracy to be uncooperative and causes our relations with high-level Soviet authorities to be encumbered with matters of second-rate importance. Instead of this, we should take our retaliatory or corrective action promptly and unhesitatingly when we do not obtain satisfaction on the lower level. It is only in this way that we can teach the Russians to respect the whole range of our officials who must deal with them. By failing to back up our subordinate officials in their dealings with the Russians, we make it difficult for ourselves to accomplish anything in the intervals between high-level meetings. This works in the interests of the Russians and prejudices our interests. This is a very important point and goes to the heart of many of our failures of the last two or three years. The top level is physically incapable of encompassing the whole range of our dealings with the Soviet government and of assuring the collaboration which we are seeking. Agreements reached there can be—and frequently are—sabotaged successfully and with impunity on the lower levels. We must train the Russians to make their whole machine, not just Stalin, respond sensibly to our approaches.

F. Do not encourage high-level exchanges of views with the Russians unless the initiative comes at least 50 percent from their side.
   Russians can be dealt with satisfactorily only when they themselves want something and feel themselves in a dependent position. It should be a matter of technique with us to see that they are not dealt with on a high level except when these conditions prevail.

G. Do not be afraid to use heavy weapons for what seem to us to be minor matters.
   This is likewise a very important point, and one which many Americans will receive with skepticism. In general, it may be bad practice to take a sledgehammer to swat a fly. With the Russians it is sometimes necessary. Russians will pursue a flexible policy of piecemeal presumption and encroachment on other people’s interests, hoping that no single action will appear important enough to produce a strong reaction on the part of their opponents, and that in this way they may gradually bring about a major improvement in their position before the other fellow knows what’s up. In this way, they have a stubborn tendency to push every question right up to what they believe to be the breaking point of the patience of those with whom they deal. If they know that their opponent means business, that the line of his patience is firmly established and that he will not hesitate to take serious measures if this line is violated even in small ways and at isolated points, they will be careful and considerate. They do not like a showdown unless they have a great preponderance of strength. But they are quick to sense and take advantage of indecision or good-natured tolerance. Whoever deals with them must therefore be sure to maintain at all times an attitude of decisiveness and alertness in the defense of his own interests.

H. Do not be afraid of unpleasantness and public airing of differences.
   The Russians don’t mind scenes and scandals. If they discover that someone else does mind them and will go out of his way to avoid them, they will use this as a form of blackmail in the belief that they can profit from the other fellow’s squeamishness. If we are to reestablish our prestige with the Soviet government and gain respect in Russia we must be prepared to undertake a “taming of the shrew” which is bound to involve a good deal of unpleasantness. On the other hand, we need not fear that occasional hard words will have permanent bad effect on our relations. The Russian is never more agreeable than after his knuckles have been sharply rapped. He takes well to rough play and rarely holds grudges over it. Let us not forget Stalin’s first reaction when he met Ribbentrop. It was to joke good-naturedly and cynically about the bitter
propaganda war which had been waged for so many years between the two countries. The Russian governing class respects only the strong. To them, shyness in dispute is a form of weakness.

I. Coordinate, in accordance with our established policies, all activities of our government relating to Russia and all private American activities of this sort which the government can influence.

The Russians are quick to take advantage of conflicts, inconsistencies, and the seeking of private aims on the part of our nationals or agencies of our government. Their own system is designed to produce the maximum concentration of national energies. We cannot face them effectively unless have do all in our power to concentrate our own effort.

J. Strengthen and support our representation in Russia.

The American embassy in Moscow is the symbol of our country to the Russians. It is watched intently by many people. It must be not only the representation of our society but also a guiding brain center of our policy toward Russia. In the face of frequent neglect and discouragement, always the object of attacks by jealous self-seekers and discontented liberals, never enjoying the fuel backing or understanding of people in Washington, never properly staffed or properly housed, it has nevertheless managed to become a pioneering establishment in the American Foreign Service and the most respected diplomatic mission in Moscow. It could do far more and play a far greater role in the Soviet Union if it received proper support. This means that failure of the Soviet government to grant quarters and other facilities for the performance of diplomatic work in Moscow must sooner or later be made an open issue between the governments and pressure must be brought to bear to improve these conditions. It means that the mission must be adequately staffed with American personnel. Finally it means that the mission must at all times be led by someone capable of and prepared for hard and tedious work over a long period of time, someone who has in high degree the qualities of modesty and patience, who is animated solely by devotion to the interests of our country, and is generally fitted by personality and background to earn the respect of a nation unexcelled in the psychological analysis of the human individual. In the case of Ambassador Harriman, I can sincerely say that I consider these prerequisites fulfilled. But I make this observation with an eye to the future. The post of ambassador to Moscow is not a sinecure which can be lightly disposed of; and the department must be prepared to use its influence to see that it is effectively filled. The Moscow mission works, and has always worked, under strain, in the face of multitudinous obstacles. A vain, fussy, and ignorant ambassador is capable of breaking its back, and of doing lasting (if not readily apparent) damage to the fabric of Russian-American relations.

Question:
1. To what degree did Kennan’s recommendations become U.S. policy?
Part 30: The Cold War and its Aftermath

30.3 Bosnia: The Two Faces of War

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the former Yugoslavia disintegrated in civil war. Groups that had lived side-by-side for decades launched themselves into brutal ethnic conflict. The two newspaper articles included here offer very different versions of the same set of events.


OLSOBODJENJE (FROM SARAJEVO)

Tomorrow, a Canadian battalion serving with the United Nations Protection Force should enter Srebrenica as a result of negotiations between Lieut. Gen. Lars-Eric Wahlgren, commander of the U.N. force, and the war criminal Karadzic [Radovan Karadzic, leader of the Bosnia Serbs]. A Golgotha continues for the citizens of Srebrenica. . . Zlatko Lagumdzija, the Deputy Prime Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina, has told the world that Milosvic’s army [President Slobodan Milosvic of Serbia], has to be stopped, that the only thing that the aggressor army understands is force, and that the only way it can be stopped is by confronting it with a greater force. . . The aggressor forces continued their offensive at Srebrenica throughout the day yesterday with undiminished intensity, and the people of the town continued to give a heroic account of themselves in resisting the attempt by the more numerous and better-armed attackers to penetrate the town’s outskirts. Besides their push across the front lines, the Chetniks [Serbian forces] continued to use their heavy artillery to shell the center of Srebrenica, massacring civilians. During the morning hours alone, the Chetnik artillery killed six people and injured 15, including several children. In Tuzia. . . local and foreign reporters were present with a transcript of an intercepted radio-telephone conversation between war criminal Mladic and the Chetnik commanders in the area. . . in which he ordered them to press their attacks so as to enter Srebrenica before he began his negotiations on a cease-fire.

POLITIKA (FROM BELGRADE)

In spite of the fact that the Muslim armed forces are facing a total military defeat, they again launched attacks this morning from various directions from the territory of Srebrenica. According to Tanjug [Yugoslav news agency] reporting from this region, the Muslim units are using all their artillery and firing equipment. The Serbian sources say that Serbian defenders had tens of dead and wounded following attacks by Muslim forces which lasted for days. The army of the Republika Srpska [the name Serb nationalists give to their self-proclaimed government in Bosnia] was forced to respond strongly in a counterattack and it has reached strategically important peaks around Srebrenica. The Serbian lines are only about one kilometer by air from Srebrenica. Using the fact that the Serbian side is not undertaking any action against Srebrenica itself, the Muslim extremists continued to attack. During the morning the most severe attacks of the Muslims were launched on Ratkovic, Zeleni Jadar, Podravanje and Milici. According to Tanjug, the Serbian sources are reporting that Muslim soldiers have started surrendering arms yesterday. There were such individual cases in the region of Skelani, Bratunac, Derventa and Podravanje. The Muslim extremists are in a hopeless situation from the military point of view. They are still reluctant to surrender because they were the ones to destroy 56 Serbian villages near Srebrenica, Bratunac and Skelani and on several occasions have killed in a most brutal way more than 1,300 Serbs, mostly women children and aged people.

Questions:
1. What are the differences between the two newspaper articles? How do you account for them?
2. Which version is closer to the truth? Why do you think that?
30.4 The Non-Aligned Movement

The non-aligned movement began in the 1950s in opposition to the rise of two superpowers and their blocs. These non-aligned nations, many of them newly independent, hoped to assert some influence on peace and security in the face of growing tensions between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. They also addressed issues of colonialism and self-determination, disarmament, the role of the United Nations, and unequal economic development. Jawaharlal Nehru, first prime minister of an independent India, addressed these concerns, including why India was non-aligned, in a 1956 television and radio address in the United States.


I speak of India because it is my country, and I have some right to speak for her. But many other countries in Asia tell the same story, for Asia today is resurgent, and these countries, which long lay under foreign yoke, have won back their independence and are fired by a new spirit and strive toward new ideals. To them, as to us, independence is as vital as the breath they take to sustain life, and colonialism in any form, or anywhere, is abhorrent.

The vast strides that technology has made have brought a new age, of which the United States of America is the leader. Today, the whole world is our neighbour and the old divisions of continents and countries matter less and less. Peace and freedom have become indivisible, and the world cannot continue for long partly free and partly subject. In this atomic age, peace has also become a test of human survival. Recently, we have witnessed two tragedies which have powerfully affected men and women all over the world. These are the tragedies in Egypt and Hungary. Our deeply felt sympathies must go out to those who have suffered or are suffering, and all of us must do our utmost to help them and to assist in solving these problems in a peaceful and constructive way. But even these tragedies have one hopeful aspect, for they have demonstrated that the most powerful countries cannot revert to old colonial methods, or impose their domination over weak countries. World opinion has shown that it can organize itself to resist such outrages. Perhaps, as an outcome of these tragedies, freedom will be enlarged and will have a more assured basis.

The preservation of peace forms the central aim of India’s policy. It is in the pursuit of this policy that we have chosen the path of non-alignment in any military or like pact or alliance. Non-alignment does not mean passivity of mind or action, lack of faith or conviction. It does not mean submission to what we consider evil. It is a positive and dynamic approach to such problems that confront us. We believe that each country has not only the right to freedom, but also to decide its own policy and way of life. Only thus can true freedom flourish and a people grow according to their own genius. We believe, therefore, in non-aggression and non-interference by one country in the affairs of another, and the growth of tolerance between them and the capacity for peaceful coexistence. We think that, by the free exchange of ideas and trade and other contacts between nations, each will learn from the other, and truth will prevail. We, therefore, endeavour to maintain friendly relations with all countries—even though we may disagree with them in their policies or structure of government. We think that, by this approach, we can serve not only our country, but also the larger causes of peace and good fellowship in the world.

Through the centuries, India has preached and practised toleration and understanding, and has enriched human thought, art and literature, philosophy and religion. Her Sons journeyed far and wide, braving the perils of land and sea, not with thoughts of conquest or domination, but as messengers of peace or engaged in the commerce of ideas as well as of her beautiful products. During these millennia of history, India has experienced both good and ill but, throughout her chequered history, she has remembered the message of peace and tolerance. In our own time, this message was proclaimed by our great leader and master, Mahatma Gandhi, who led us to freedom by peaceful and yet effective action on a mass scale. Nine years ago, we won our independence through a bloodless revolution, in conditions of honour and dignity both to ourselves and to the erstwhile rulers of our country. We in India today are children of this revolution and have been conditioned by it. Although your revolution in America took place long ago and the conditions were different here, you will appreciate the revolutionary spirit which we have inherited and which still governs our activities.

Having attained political freedom, we are earnestly desirous of removing the many ills that our country suffers from, of eliminating poverty and raising the standards of our people, and giving them full and equal opportunities of growth and advancement.
India is supposed to be given to contemplation, and the American people have shown by their history that they possess great energy, dynamism and the passion to march ahead. Something of that contemplative spirit still remains in India. But, at the same time, the new India of today has also developed a certain dynamism and a passionate desire to raise the standards of her people. But with that desire is blended the wish to adhere to the moral and spiritual aspects of life. We are now engaged in a gigantic and exciting task of achieving rapid and large-scale economic development of our country. Such development, in an ancient and underdeveloped country such as India, is only possible with purposive planning. True to our democratic principles and traditions, we seek in free discussion and consultation, as well as in implementations the enthusiasm and the willing and active co-operation of our people. We completed our first Five-Year Plan eight months ago, and now we have begun, on a more ambitious scale, our second Five-Year Plan, which seeks a planned development in agriculture and industry, town and country, and between factory and small-scale and cottage production.

Questions:
1. How does Nehru discuss India’s past, present, and future? To what purpose?
2. What is non-alignment? How does Nehru define its purpose?
3. How might the fact that he is addressing an American audience influence how he says what he says?
30.5 Stokely Carmichael: What We Want

Stokely Carmichael (1941–1998), a recent graduate of Howard University, had just been elected head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) in 1966 when he first uttered the phrase “Black Power” during a civil rights march in Mississippi. In May 1967 he joined the more militant Black Panthers, but rejected fellow Panther Eldridge Cleaver’s belief that coalitions could be formed with liberal whites. Emigrating from the United States in 1969 to Guinea, he changed his name to Kwame Ture. By 1971 he was advocating a homeland in Africa for oppressed blacks. The following article was written in 1966, explaining what he meant by Black Power.


Ultimately, the economic foundations of this country must be shaken if black people are to control their lives. The colonies of the United States—and this includes the black ghettos within its borders, north and south—must be liberated. For a century, this nation has been like an octopus of exploitation, its tentacles stretching from Mississippi and Harlem to South America, the Middle East, southern Africa, and Vietnam; the form of exploitation varies from area to area but the essential result has been the same—a powerful few have been maintained and enriched at the expense of the poor and voiceless colored masses. This pattern must be broken. As its grip loosens here and there around the world, the hopes of black Americans become more realistic. For racism to die, a totally different America must be born.

This is what the white society does not wish to face; this is why that society prefers to talk about integration. But integration speaks not at all to the problem of poverty, only to the problem of blackness. Integration today means the man who “makes it,” leaving his black brothers behind in the ghetto as fast as his new sports car will take him. It has no relevance to the Harlem wino or to the cottonpicker making three dollars a day....

Integration, moreover, speaks to the problem of blackness in a despicable way. As a goal, it has been based on complete acceptance of the fact that in order to have a decent house or education, blacks must move into a white neighborhood or send their children to a white school. This reinforces, among both black and white, the idea that “white” is automatically better and “black” is by definition inferior. This is why integration is a subterfuge for the maintenance of white supremacy. It allows the nation to focus on a handful of Southern children who get into white schools, at great price, and to ignore the 95 per cent who are left behind in unimproved all-black schools. Such situations will not change until black people have power—to control their own school boards, in this case. Then Negroes become equal in a way that means something, and integration ceases to be a one-way street. Then integration doesn’t mean draining skills and energies from the ghetto into white neighborhoods; then it can mean white people moving from Beverly Hills into Watts, white people joining the Lowndes County Freedom Organization. Then integration becomes relevant.

Last April, before the furor over black power, Christopher Jencks wrote in a New Republic article on white Mississippi’s manipulation of the anti-poverty program:

The war on poverty has been predicated on the notion that there is such a thing as a community which can be defined geographically and mobilized for a collective effort to help the poor. This theory has no relationship to reality in the Deep South. In every Mississippi county there are two communities. Despite all the pious platitudes of the moderates on both sides, these two communities habitually see their interests in terms of conflict rather than cooperation. Only when the Negro community can muster enough political, economic and professional strength to compete on somewhat equal terms, will Negroes believe in the possibility of true cooperation and whites accept its necessity. En route to integration, the Negro community needs to develop greater independence—a chance to run its own affairs and not cave in whenever “the man” barks... Or so it seems to me, and to most of the knowledgeable people with whom I talked in Mississippi....
Mr. Jencks, a white reporter, perceived the reason why America’s anti-poverty program has been a sick farce in both North and South. In the South, it is clearly racism which prevents the poor from running their own programs; in the North, it more often seems to be politicking and bureaucracy. But the results are not so different: In the North, nonwhites make up 42 per cent of all families in metropolitan “poverty areas” and only 6 per cent of families in areas classified as not poor. SNCC\(^2\) has been working with local residents in Arkansas, Alabama, and Mississippi to achieve control by the poor of the program and its funds; it has also been working with groups in the North, and the struggle is no less difficult. Behind it all is a federal government which cares far more about winning the war on the Vietnamese than the war on poverty; which has put the poverty program in the hands of self-serving politicians and bureaucrats rather than the poor themselves; which is unwilling to curb the misuse of white power but quick to condemn black power.

To most whites, black power seems to mean that the Mau Mau are coming to the suburbs at night. The Mau Mau are coming, and whites must stop them. Articles appear about plots to “get Whitey,” creating an atmosphere in which “law and order must be maintained.” Once again, responsibility is shifted from the oppressor to the oppressed. Other whites chide, “Don’t forget—you’re only 10 per cent of the population; if you get too smart, we’ll wipe you out.” If they are liberals, they complain, “What about me?—don’t you want my help any more?” These are people supposedly concerned about black Americans, but today they think first of themselves, of their feelings of rejection. Or they admonish, “you can’t get anywhere without coalitions,” without considering the problems of coalition with whom?; on what terms? (coalescing from weakness can mean absorption, betrayal); when? Or they accuse us of “polarizing the races” by our calls for black unity, when the true responsibility for polarization lies with whites who will not accept their responsibility as the majority power for making the democratic process work.

White America will not face the problem of color, the reality of it. The well-intended say: “We’re all human, everybody is really decent, we must forget color.” But color cannot be “forgotten” until its weight is recognized and dealt with. White America will not acknowledge that the ways in which this country sees itself are contradicted by being black—and always have been. Whereas most of the people who settled this country came here for freedom or for economic opportunity, blacks were brought here to be slaves. When the Lowndes County Freedom Organization chose the black panther as its symbol, it was christened by the press “the Black Panther Party”—but the Alabama Democratic Party, whose symbol is a rooster, has never been called the White Cock Party. No one ever talked about “white power” because power in this country is white. All this adds up to more than merely identifying a group phenomenon by some catchy name or adjective. The furor over that black panther reveals the problems that white America has with color and sex; the furor over “black power” is a rooster, has never been called the White Cock Party. No one ever talked about “white power” because power in this country is white. All this adds up to more than merely identifying a group phenomenon by some catchy name or adjective. The furor over that black panther reveals the problems that white America has with color and sex; the furor over “black power” reveals how deep racism runs and the great fear which is attached to it.

Whites will not see that I, for example, as a person oppressed because of my blackness, have common cause with other blacks who are oppressed because of blackness. This is not to say that there are no white people who see things as I do, but that it is black people I must speak to first. It must be the oppressed to whom SNCC addresses itself primarily, not to friends from the oppressing group.

From birth, black people are told a set of lies about themselves. We are told that we are lazy—yet I drive through the Delta area of Mississippi and watch black people picking cotton in the hot sun for fourteen hours. We are told, “If you work hard, you’ll succeed”—but if that were true, black people would own this country. We are oppressed because we are black—not because we are ignorant, not because we are lazy, not because we’re stupid (and got good rhythm), but because we’re black.

I remember that when I was a boy, I used to go to see Tarzan movies on Saturday. White Tarzan used to beat up the black natives. I would sit there yelling, “Kill the beasts, kill the savages, kill ‘em!” I was saying: “Kill me. It was as if a Jewish boy watched Nazis taking Jews off to concentration camps and cheered them on. Today, I want the chief to beat hell out of Tarzan and send him back to Europe. But it takes time to become free of the lies and their shaming effect on black minds. It takes time to reject the most important lie: that black people inherently can’t do the same things white people can do, unless white people help them.

The need for psychological equality is the reason why SNCC today believes that blacks must organize in the black community. Only black people can convey the revolutionary idea that black people are able to do things themselves. Only they can help create in the community an aroused and continuing black consciousness that will provide the basis for political strength. In the past, white allies have furthered white supremacy without the whites involved realizing it—or wanting it, I think. Black people must do things for themselves; they must get poverty money they will control and spend themselves, they must conduct tutorial programs themselves so that black children can identify with black people. This is one reason Africa has such importance: The reality of black men ruling their own nations gives blacks elsewhere a sense of possibility, of power, which they do not now have.
This does not mean we don’t welcome help, or friends. But we want the right to decide whether anyone is, in fact, our friend. In the past, black Americans have been almost the only people whom everybody and his momma could jump up and call their friends. We have been tokens, symbols, objects—as I was in high school to many young whites, who liked having “a Negro friend.” We want to decide who is our friend, and we will not accept someone who comes to us and says: “If you do, X, Y, and Z, then I’ll help you.” We will not be told whom we should choose as allies. We will not be isolated from any group or nation except by our own choice. We cannot have the oppressors telling the oppressed how to rid themselves of the oppressor.

I have said that most liberal whites react to “black power” with the question, What about me?, rather than saying: Tell me what you want me to do and I’ll see if I can do it. There are answers to the right question. One of the most disturbing things about almost all white supporters of the movement has been that they are afraid to go into their own communities—which is where the racism exists—and work to get rid of it. They want to run from Berkeley to tell us what to do in Mississippi; let them look instead at Berkeley. They admonish blacks to be nonviolent; let them preach nonviolence in the white community. They come to teach me Negro history; let them go to the suburbs and open up freedom schools for whites. Let them work to stop America’s racist foreign policy; let them press this government to cease supporting the economy of South Africa.

... Black people do not want to “take over” this country. They don’t want to “get whitey”; they just want to get him off their backs, as the saying goes. It was for example the exploitation by Jewish landlords and merchants which first created black resentment toward Jews—not Judaism. The white man is irrelevant to blacks, except as an oppressive force. Blacks want to be in his place, yes, but not in order to terrorize and Lynch and starve him. They want to be in his place because that is where a decent life can be had.

But our vision is not merely of a society in which all black men have enough to buy the good things of life. When we urge that black money go into black pockets, we mean the communal pocket. We want to see money go back into the community and used to benefit it. We want to see the cooperative concept applied in business and banking. We want to see black ghetto residents demand that an exploiting landlord or storekeeper sell them, at minimal cost, a building or a shop that they will own and improve cooperatively; they can back their demand with a rent strike, or a boycott, and a community so unified behind them that no one else will move into the building or buy at the store. The society we seek to build among black people, then, is not a capitalist one. It is a society in which the spirit of community and humanistic love prevail. The word love is suspect; black expectations of what it might produce have been betrayed too often. But those were expectations of a response from the white community, which failed us. The love we seek to encourage is within the black community, the only American community where men call each other “brother” when they meet. We can build a community of love only where we have the ability and power to do so among blacks.

As for white America, perhaps it can stop crying out against “black supremacy,” “black nationalism,” “racism in reverse,” and begin facing reality. The reality is that this nation, from top to bottom, is racist; that racism is not primarily a problem of “human relations” but of an exploitation maintained—either actively or through silence—by the society as a whole. Camus and Sartre have asked, can a man condemn himself? Can whites, particularly liberal whites, condemn themselves? Can they stop blaming us, and blame their own system? Are they capable of the shame which might become a revolutionary emotion?

We have found that they usually cannot condemn themselves, and so we have done it. But the rebuilding of this society, if at all possible, is basically the responsibility of whites—not blacks. We won’t fight to save the present society, in Vietnam or anywhere else. We are just going to work, in the way we see fit, and on goals we define, not for civil rights but for all our human rights.

Questions:
1. Why does Carmichael say that integration “is a subterfuge for the maintenance of white supremacy?”
2. What does he mean when he declares, “color cannot be ‘forgotten’ until its weight is recognized and dealt with?”
3. How relevant or applicable is Carmichael’s article today?
30.6 The Wall in My Backyard

In an interview in October 1990, Helga Schlitz, a Berlin film maker and writer, spoke about the “Wende,” the “turn” or “change” that occurred in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in November 1989, when the Berlin Wall fell. As a journalist, she had more privileges and access to the outside world than most East Germans did.


Just before the Wende I was in Washington, D.C., and heard the news about the demonstrations on October 7 and 8. I was terribly afraid and of course also full of hope. I went right home. In September 1989, a group of writers had sent a letter to the Central Committee of the Party protesting the blatant misrepresentation by the GDR press of the mass emigrations of young people through the Hungarian border. We couldn’t stand the lies any longer. Because of the serious confrontations in September, I had the feeling that things would be very tough in October.

When I got home in the middle of October, things had reached a climax. There were big Monday night demonstrations in Leipzig and also here in Potsdam in front of the Stasi jail and Stasi headquarters. Then there was a meeting of New Forum in the Friedrichskirche here in Babelsberg very near where I live. I attended that too. A group of women writers who had been meeting for years in Berlin went together to the November 4 demonstration at Alexanderplatz. Then things really began to happen.

It was clear to me that the Wall had to come down. I felt very strongly about that, even before the Hungarian border was opened. Whenever people spoke about glasnost and perestroika and demanded freedom to travel, I knew that it wouldn’t be possible to open the Wall only a little bit, for only a few people to be allowed to travel, or for a certain number of people to be able to have a look at the other side. There would always be control on travel. But even so, November 9 was a tremendous surprise for me. I thought the announcement meant an easing of travel restrictions, but I expected that people would still have to apply for permission to travel and that only a small number would be granted that permission. I knew that our people would simply not be satisfied with that. The Wall had to go. But I imagined it would happen differently. I thought the Wall would disappear overnight, that they would come with hammers and wheelbarrows and take it away. It didn’t happen like that of course, but the whole thing had a strong sense of the irrational to it. It was very hard to comprehend.

I lived for eighteen years with the Wall in my backyard in Großglienicke, on the border to West Berlin, and we talked about the Wall every single day of the year, how inane it was. You could hear people on the other side talking but you would have been shot if you had tried to talk to them. When the Wall was finally down, we rode our bikes over every evening with hammers and chopped away at it, trying to get it out of our sight. We would ride along the Wall, looking for a hole that was big enough to slip through. It was completely crazy. Suddenly you could walk where only weeks or days before you would have been shot.

On November 9 I came home at around midnight. I had been giving a reading in West Berlin. On the bus I heard some people saying that now everyone would be allowed to travel; they had heard it on the radio. When I got to my stop, there was a group of young people who said that they wanted to take the bus back to West Berlin. The driver told them to get on if they thought it would work. Then we saw the first Trabis driving in the direction of the border. When I got home my son and I sat and watched TV intoxicated with joy. We watched the entire night. The next day he told me that they were going to open the Glienick Bridge at 6:00 P.M., so we all marched over the bridge, the entire city of Potsdam. I was with friends of my son’s, and we simply floated across the bridge. It was pure joy. We hadn’t been able to take any champagne with us, but when we crossed over to the West they gave us some.

It was wonderful for me that it was no longer a privilege to cross the border—now everyone could cross. I had always had the feeling that our people here were being deceived; they didn’t know what was really going on over there because they couldn’t see it. There were great misconceptions. When I was in the West I felt I could do without many things that were available there: I didn’t need that pair of shoes, that book. Then I got home and realized that I really did need those things. My son wanted a certain record, for example. They were little things, but because you couldn’t get them they represented paradise. Now everyone could finally see this paradise themselves. They could touch it and realize that they could actually live without it. But they had to experience it first before they could start to reexamine their own values.
I wanted unification, but I wanted it to be different. Once this one dream of an open border had come true I thought all the other dreams could come true as well, for example, that we would get rid of the military. I never thought we would automatically have to join NATO. Just how great my illusions were has been demonstrated by the involvement of Germany in the Persian Gulf War. As soon as Germany’s East-West conflict was solved, the Gulf War followed immediately.

I see unification as positive because I don’t think there was any other way. That’s the way the world is, and we have to accept it, even though there have been innumerable mistakes and huge catastrophes. Thousands of people are unemployed and yet there is so much work to be done just lying around on the streets. I wasn’t a supporter of the so-called Third Way, the establishment of a democratic but separate East German state. I think Europe can only act reasonably if it’s united. We all have to get past our own private sphere and come together. I didn’t feel like a citizen of the German Democratic Republic; I felt a part of something bigger, maybe Europe. We Europeans had a common history and I never had the feeling that the common cultural heritage between West and East had been broken off. I knew that the Western economy functioned better than ours—not because it was a consumer society, a throw-away society—but because they paid much more attention to the environment than we did. The shortages didn’t bother me as much as the fact that our economic system treated the environment so badly.

I’m very happy to be rid of all of the bureaucracy and the hassles that were part of our everyday existence. Whenever I got an invitation to a reading in the West I had to go to the Writers’ Association (Schriftstellerverband), to make a travel application. After about six weeks I got a visa. If I had several invitations within a two- or three-week period I could get a visa that was good for more than one visit, which was wonderful because I knew that if I wanted to leave the country I could. I thought about leaving, but I never did it because of my children, and besides I’m a rather sedentary person. It was a beautiful feeling to know that the Wall was penetrable, but I couldn’t see leaving the children behind this Wall forever and ever. They had a right to travel and see things. In the last three or four years I thought less and less about leaving.

I saw my role as a writer in this society as writers all over the world see their role in society, only increasingly I came to perceive that I wasn’t writing for people outside the GDR but instead for those who lived inside this Wall, for my neighbors. This created considerable problems. I had to write about the many things that didn’t appear in our media, and so I had to work more like a journalist. The subject matter ended up being very provincial. I could never concentrate simply on form; I was constantly interrupted by daily matters. Everyday life intruded into everything I wrote.

I tried to convince myself that I wasn’t interested in being critical of our society, but I was. I wrote within the context of the literature that existed, GDR literature. If one writer approached one forbidden subject in his writing, I would touch on another. We didn’t discuss this among ourselves, but we knew what others were writing about. We read everything. Out of this context emerged my own writing. My writing always had the goal of expanding the limits of what was possible.

In the GDR there was censorship. You knew where the allergic spots were, what points were supposed to be avoided; you simply knew. You felt you had a duty to mention one of these allergic points. Not that you necessarily wanted to make Honecker* angry; it was nothing quite so primitive or direct. It was indirect. I don’t know if literature can actually change anything. Its task is more to create a sense of solidarity among people. Readers who feel that they are only a tiny fraction can get a sense of the whole; they can find themselves in the piece of literature they are reading.

West Germans are criticizing East German writers now for having been cowards, but the little bit that we did was all that you could manage; it was all you could get away with. You couldn’t throw too many things into the balance because that would have destroyed the equilibrium. Everyone was interested in coexistence. No one dared to confront the largest, most important problems, not writers, not anyone. Writers weren’t cowards; they just knew how far they could go. If I held a reading of a text that I considered terribly brave in which I talked about refusing military service, for example, and I had a forum of young people who hung on every word and thought I was a terrific role model, these young people then went home and said, “Let’s stage a protest at school.” They got thrown in jail while I sat comfortably at home. This was a terrible conflict for me. I tried to avoid reading texts like that. I was always aware that nothing would happen to me because I was protected by my notoriety.
I was aware of the privilege I enjoyed and made it one of the themes in my last books. I had to. I couldn’t talk about anything that happened outside the Wall without bringing up the topic of privilege. It was always one of the main conflicts. Maybe I was trying to come to terms with it myself by writing about it. I wondered why people who were fairly well known didn’t fight for the same privilege I had. For example, I couldn’t understand why academics didn’t refuse to work if they weren’t allowed to travel to a certain conference. But this is an example of the not very well thought-out reproaches we leveled against one another. The fact that I was an artist with no boss to answer to was one of the privileges I enjoyed.

The people in the West who criticized us the loudest were the ones who wanted to keep everything intact here. For example, I made a film for a West German TV station about the city of Rostock. At the risk of my life—no, not that great—but at great risk, I tried to show the disintegration that was occurring in Rostock. Someone was always watching me during the filming, but when he left for a few minutes I told the cameraman to take a certain house which was falling apart or other evidence of the actual condition of the city—not only the lovely facade but the real interior—to show what our cities really looked like. I tried to get these things into the film, even though I knew that I would have great problems when I got home and people saw it on TV.

But censorship also occurred in the West. The editors of this particular TV station thought the film was unkind and cold; they wanted to see only the beautiful GDR. That was very sweet of them, but it wasn’t the whole truth, and if you tried to show a piece of the truth they wouldn’t play along. They didn’t want to see the true picture. For this same reason they received Honecker with great pomp and ceremony. It was all done in the name of compromise. And now it’s the writers alone who are said to have been the cowards. The people in the West wanted to believe that everything here was all right, and now they’re shocked and surprised at how things really were. Maybe they should have read our books more carefully and watched our films more attentively, and maybe they should have looked more closely when they took their trips through the GDR.

I had two children: a daughter, who was severely disabled and died when she was twelve, and a son. I was never married, but filmmaker Egon Gunther and I lived together for a long, long time. The issue of “illegitimate children” here in the GDR was completely unimportant. No one cared about who would inherit what and what money belonged to whom because the money wasn’t worth anything. There was something to be said for living in a society where money didn’t play a big role. I always had my daughter with me, and I think I started writing because I wanted to do something I could do at home. My daughter actually brought me to writing. I can’t complain, although it was difficult, because I felt so enriched through Claudia.

Women here were emancipated, but it was tremendously difficult for them because they had to fight for their everyday existence. But they managed to come away with their piece of the pie. All around me here are women who worked because they wanted to and wouldn’t have given that up. In comparison to women in West Germany and the United States, women here look very gray. Our women look worn out and don’t fit the image of Western women. You can’t see their emancipation on the outside. But you can see on the inside that they have worked, that they are independent, and that they know life. They also experienced the solidarity that this difficult daily existence brought with it. I don’t know if this sort of thing exists in the West; I don’t know the West well enough. But I must say, I was very impressed with the solidarity I saw in U.S. women. In 1984 I went to the Women in German (WiG) meeting in Boston with very mixed feelings. I thought, oh dear, I’m going to be in a group of women who feel they have gotten the short end of the stick in a man’s world and are trying to assert themselves any way they can. I was very pleasantly surprised that it wasn’t like that at all, and I was a little envious. Such conscious opposition wouldn’t have been possible here. Here things happened under the surface.

Questions:
1. How did she experience the events surrounding the fall of the Berlin Wall?
2. What did the fall of the wall mean for her personally and politically?
3. What hopes did she have with the collapse of the old government? A year later, what was her perspective? Were those hopes being fulfilled? How or how not?