AP European History
Unit 2.2
The Age of Reason
(1648-1815)
The **BIG** Question:

How and to what extent did the Enlightenment challenge existing traditional views?
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Francis Bacon Rejects Superstition and Extols the Virtue of Science (1620)

The discoveries which have hitherto been made in the sciences are such as lie close to vulgar notions, scarcely beneath the surface. In order to penetrate into the inner and further recesses of nature, it is necessary that both notions and axioms be derived from things by a more sure and guarded way, and that a method of intellectual operation be introduced altogether better and more certain. ...

There is no soundness in our notions, whether logical or physical. Substance, quality, action, passion, essence itself are not sound notions; much less are heavy, light, dense, rare, moist, dry, generation, corruption, attraction, repulsion, element, matter, form, and the like; but all are fantastical and ill-defined. ...

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 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. ...

It is not to be forgotten that in every age natural philosophy has had a troublesome adversary and hard to deal with,—namely, superstition and the blind and immoderate zeal of religion. For we see among the Greeks that those who first proposed to man’s uninitiated ears the natural causes for thunder and for storms were thereupon found guilty of impiety. Nor was much more forbearance shown by some of the ancient fathers of the Christian Church to those who, on most convincing grounds (such as no one in his senses would now think of contradicting), maintained that the earth was round and, of consequence, asserted the existence of the antipodes.

Moreover, as things now are, to discourse of nature is made harder and more perilous by the summaries and systems of the schoolmen; who, having reduced theology into regular order as well as they were able, and fashioned it into the shape of an art, ended in incorporating the contentious and thorny philosophy of Aristotle, more than was fit, with the body of religion. ...

Lastly, some are weakly afraid lest a deeper search into nature should transgress the permitted limits of sobermindedness; wrongfully wresting and transferring what is said in Holy Writ against those who pry into sacred mysteries to the hidden things of nature, which are barred by no prohibition. Others, with more subtlety, surmise and reflect that if secondary causes are unknown everything can be more readily referred to the divine hand and rod,—a point in which they think religion greatly concerned; which is, in fact, nothing else but to seek to gratify God with a lie. Others fear from past example that movements and changes in philosophy will end in assaults on religion; and others again appear apprehensive that in the investigation of nature something may be found to subvert, or at least shake, the authority of religion, especially with the unlearned.

But these two last fears seem to me to savor utterly of carnal wisdom; as if men in the recesses and secret thoughts of their hearts doubted and distrusted the strength of religion, and the empire of faith over the senses, and therefore feared that the investigation of truth in nature might be dangerous to them. But if the matter be truly considered, natural philosophy is, after the word of God, at once the surest medicine against superstition and the most approved nourishment for faith; and therefore she is rightly given to religion as her most faithful handmaid, since the one displays the will of God, the other his power. ...
Denis Diderot, From the Voyage to Bougainville

In the division which the Tahitians made of Bougainville’s crew, the chaplain fell to the lot of Orou. They were about the same age, thirty-five to thirty-six. Just then Orou had at home only his wife and three daughters, Asto, Palli and Thia. These undressed him, washed his face, hands and feet, and served him a healthy meal. When he was about to go to bed, Orou, who had gone away with his family, reappeared, presented his wife and three daughters quite naked and said: “Thou hast had supper, thou art young and in good health. Sleep alone, and thou wilt sleep badly. Man needs a companion by his side at night. Here … are my daughters. Take your choice… The chaplain replied that his religion, his calling, good morals and honorability forbade him to accept this offer…

OROU: "I do not know what thou meanest by religion, but I cannot think well of it, if it forbids thee to enjoy an innocent pleasure, to which nature… invites us all -- to give existence to one like thee: to render a service that father mother and children ask of thee; to make a fitting return to a host who has welcomed thee warmly and to enrich a nation, by increase, with one subject the more. I do not know what thou meanest by thy calling. But thy first duty is to be a man and grateful. I dare not suggest that thou carry away into thy country the morals of Orou. But Orou, thy host and friend, beseeches thee to lend thyself to the morals of Tahiti. Are the morals of Tahiti better or worse than yours? It is a question that can be easily settled. Has the country of thy birth more children than it can feed? In that case thy morals are neither better nor worse than ours. Can it feed more than it has? Then our morals are better than thine… See the care thou hast spread on [these women’s] faces. They fear thou hast remarked in them some faults which have made thee disdain them. But even so, would not the pleasure of honoring one of my daughters, among her companions and sisters, and doing a good action, make up for this? Be generous.

THE CHAPLAIN: It is not that: they are all equally beautiful:. but my religion… my calling!

OROU: They belong to me and I offer them to thee. They are their own and they give themselves to thee. Whatever may be the purity of conscience which the thing religion and the thing calling prescribe, thou canst accept them without scruple. I do not abuse my authority; thou mayest be certain I know and respect the rights of men. … But pray tell me what is this word religion, that thou didst repeat so often and with so much pain?"

CHAPLAIN: Who made thy cabin and its articles of furniture?
OROU: I did.

CHAPLAIN: Very well, we believe that this world and all it contains is the work of a workman.
OROU: Then he has feet, hands and a head?
CHAPLAIN: No.

OROU: Where does he live?
CHAPLAIN: Everywhere
OROU: Here too?
CHAPLAIN: Yes
OROU: We have never seen him.
CHAPLAIN: He is not to be seen.
OROU: A poor sort of father! He must be old. For he must be at least as old as his handiwork.
CHAPLAIN: He never grows old. He has spoken to our ancestors: he has given them laws: and has prescribed the manner in which he would be honored. He has ordained for them certain actions as good and forbidden them others as bad.
OROU: I see, and one of those actions he has forbidden as bad is to sleep with a woman or girl. Why then has he made two sexes?
CHAPLAIN: For union, but on certain fixed conditions and after certain preliminary ceremonies, as a result of which a man belongs to a woman and belongs to her alone. A woman belongs to a man and belongs to a man alone.
OROU: For their whole life?
CHAPLAIN: Yes
OROU: So that if a woman slept with anyone else than her husband and a husband with anyone else than his wife -- but the case can never arise, for since the workman is there and disapproves of it, he knows how to stop them.
CHAPLAIN: No, he lets them go their way, and they sin against the law of God (for that is what we call the great workman) and the law of the land; and they commit a crime.
OROU: I should hate to offend you with my remarks, but with your permission, I will give you my opinion… I find these singular precepts opposed to nature and contrary to reason: they needs must multiply the number of crimes and continually annoy the old workman, who has made everything without the help of head, hands, or tools, who exists everywhere and is to
be seen nowhere: who endures [forever]: who commands and is never obeyed: who can prevent and does not do so. These precepts are contrary to nature because they presuppose that a thinking, feeling, free being can be the property of another like himself. Upon what can this right be founded? Do you not see that, in your country, you have mixed up two different things? That which has neither feeling, thought, desire nor will, and which one can take, keep or exchange, without its suffering or complaining; and that which cannot be exchanged or acquired: which has liberty, will, desires: which can give itself and refuse itself for a single instant, or for ever: which complains and suffers: which could not become a mere article of commerce without its character being forgotten and violence done to its nature? These precepts are contrary to the general law of existence. Does anything really appear to thee more senseless than a precept which refuses to admit the change which is in ourselves: which insists on a constancy which has no counterpart in us and which violates the liberty of male and female, by chaining them for ever one to the other: more senseless than a constancy which confines the most capricious of pleasures to a single person: than an oath of immutability between two fleshly beings in the face of a heaven which is not a moment the same: …beneath a rock that falls in powder: at the foot of a tree that cracks: upon a stone that breaks in pieces? Believe me, you have made the condition of men worse than that of animals. I know not who thy great workman is. But I am glad he has never spoken to our fathers and I hope he never speaks to our children. For he might say the same silly things to them and they might be silly enough to believe him. Yesterday at supper thou toldest of magistrates and priests, whose authority rules your conduct. But tell me, are they lords of good and evil? Can they make what is just unjust, and what is unjust just? Does it rest with them to label good actions harmful and harmful actions innocent or useful? Thou canst not well admit it, for then there would be neither true nor false, good nor bad, beautiful nor ugly, except in so far as thy great workman, thy magistrates and priests thought good to say so. Then from one moment to another thou wouldst be compelled to change thy opinion and thy conduct. …Dost thou wish to know what is good and bad in all times and all places? Cling to the nature of things and actions: to thy relations with those like thee: to the influence of thy conduct on thy private convenience and the public good. Thou art mad if thou thinkest there be anything, high or low, in the universe which can supplement or be subtracted from the law of nature. Her eternal will is that good be preferred to evil and public to private good.
Voltaire, Treatise on Religious Toleration (1763)

Chapter XXI. Universal Toleration

It does not require ant great art or studied eloquence, to prove, that Christians should tolerate each other. I shall go further, and say, that we should regard all men as our brethren. What! a Turk my brother? a Chinese my brother? a Jew? a Siamese? my brother? Yes, without doubt; for are we not all children of the same father, and creatures of the same God?

But these people despise us and treat us as idolaters! It may be so; but I shall only tell them, they are to be blamed. It seems to me, I should stagger the haughty obstinacy of an Iman, or a Talapoin, if I spoke to them in the following manner: This little globe, which is but a point, rolls in universal space, in the same manner as other globes, and we are lost in the immensity. Man, a being about five feet in height, is assuredly a thing of no great importance in the creation. One of those beings, called men, and who are hardly perceptible, says to some of his neighbors in Arabia or in the country of the Cafres. “Attend to what I say, for the God of all these worlds has enlightened me. There are about nine hundred millions of little ants, such as we are, on this earth, but my ant hill alone is in the care of God, all the rest have been faithful to hum from [i.e., for] all eternity; we only shall be happy; all others shall be eternally wretched.”

They would stop me, and ask, who is this madman, who utters such folly? I should be obliged to answer each of them, “It is you.” I might then take occasion to meliorate their dispositions into something like humanity; but that I should find difficult.

I will now address myself to Christians; and venture to say a Dominican, who is an inquisitor, “My brother, you know, that every province of Italy has its jargon; that they do not speak at Venice and Bergamo as they do at Florence. The Academy de la Crusca has fixed the general disposition and construction of the language; its dictionary is a rule from which no deviations are allowed; and the grammar of Buon mattei’s is an infallible guide, which must be followed. But do you think that the consul, president of the academy, or in his absence, Buon mattei, could have the conscience, to order the tongues of all the Venetians and Bergamese to be cut out, who should persist in their provincial dialects?”

The inquisitor would answer me: “The cases are very different. The question here is the salvation of your soul: it is for your good, that the court of inquisition ordains, that you should be seized, on the deposition of a single person, though he be infamous, and in the hands of justice: that you have no advocate to plead for you; that the very name of your accuser should be unknown to you; that the inquisitor should promise you mercy, and afterwards condemn you; that he apply five different kinds of torture to you, and afterwards you should be whipt [i.e., whipped] or sent to the galleys, or burnt [at the stake] as a spectacle in a religious ceremony. Father Ivonet, and Doctor[s] Cuchalon, Zarchinus, Campegius, Royas, Telinus, Gomarus, Diabaruss, and Gemelinus lay down these things as laws, and this pious practice must not be disputed. “I would take the liberty to answer, “My brother, perhaps you are right; I am convinced of the good you wish to do me; but, without all this, is it not possible to be saved?”

It is true that these absurd horrors do not always deform the face of the earth; but they have been very frequent; and we might collect materials to compose a volume on these practices much larger than the gospels which condemn them. It is not only cruel to persecute in this short life those who do not think as we do, but it is audacious to pronounce their eternal damnation. It seems to me, that it little becomes the atoms of a moment [i.e., such insignificant, ephemeral creature], such as we are, thus to anticipate the decrees of the Creator. I am very far from opposing that opinion, “that out of [i.e., outside] the church there is no salvation.” I respect it, as well as everything taught by the church: but, in truth, are we acquainted with all the ways of God, and the whole extent of his mercy? Is it not sufficient that we are faithful to the church? Is it necessary that every individual should usurp the power of the Deity, and decide, before him, the eternal lot of all mankind?
Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*

**BACKGROUND:** Jean-Jacques Rousseau stresses, like John Locke, the idea of a social contract as the basis of society. Locke’s version emphasised a contact between the governors and the governed: Rousseau’s was in a way much more profound - the social contract was between all members of society, and essentially replaced “natural” rights as the basis for human claims.

**BOOK 1, CH. 6: “THE SOCIAL PACT”**

Man was born free, but everywhere he is in chains. This man believes that he is the master of others, and still he is more of a slave than they are. How did that transformation take place? I don’t know. How may the restraints on man become legitimate? I do believe I can answer that question....

At a point in the state of nature when the obstacles to human preservation have become greater than each individual with his own strength can cope with... an adequate combination of forces must be the result of men coming together. Still, each man’s power and freedom are his main means of self-preservation. How is he to put them under the control of others without damaging himself...?

This question might be rephrased: “How is a method of associating to be found which will defend and protect—using the power of all—the person and property of each member and still enable each member of the group to obey only himself and to remain as free as before?” This is the fundamental problem; the social contract offers a solution to it...

The social contract’s terms, when they are well understood, can be reduced to a single stipulation: the individual member alienates himself totally to the whole community together with all his rights. This is first because conditions will be the same for everyone when each individual gives himself totally, and secondly, because no one will be tempted to make that condition of shared equality worse for other men....

Once this multitude is united this way into a body, an offense against one of its members is an offense against the body politic. It would be even less possible to injure the body without its members feeling it. Duty and interest thus equally require the two contracting parties to aid each other mutually. The individual people should be motivated from their double roles as individuals and members of the body, to combine all the advantages which mutual aid offers them....

**INDIVIDUAL WILLS AND THE GENERAL WILL**

Despite their common interest, subjects will not be bound by their commitment to the common interest, unless means are found to guarantee their [loyalty.]

In reality, each individual has...His own particular interest [that] may be in conflict with the common interest. His ...independent existence may make him imagine that what he owes to the common cause is ...a contribution which will cost him more to give than [any harm not giving it may inflict.] He may ... wish to enjoy the rights of a citizen without performing the duties of a subject. This unjust attitude could cause the ruin of the body politic if it became widespread enough.

So that the social pact will not become meaningless words, it tacitly includes this commitment, which alone gives power to the others: Whoever refuses to obey the general will shall be forced to obey it by the whole body politic, which means nothing else but that he will be forced to be free. This condition is indeed the one which by dedicating each citizen to the fatherland gives him a guarantee against being personally dependent on other individuals. It is the condition which all political machinery depends on and which alone makes political undertakings legitimate. Without it, political actions become tyrannical, and subject to abuses....

**INDIVISIBLE, INALIENABLE SOVEREIGNTY**

The first and most important conclusion from the principles we have established thus far is that the general will alone may direct the forces of the State to achieve the goal for which it was founded, the common good.... Sovereignty is indivisible ... and is inalienable.... A will is general or it is not: it is that of the whole body of the people or only of one faction....

Our political theorists, however, unable to divide the source of sovereignty, divide sovereignty into the ways it is applied. They divide it into force and will; into legislative power and executive power;
into the power to tax, the judicial power, and the power to wage war; into internal administration and the power to negotiate with foreign countries. Now we see them running these powers together. Now they will proceed to separate them. They make the sovereign a being of fantasy, composed of separate pieces, which would be like putting a man together from several bodies, one having eyes, another arms, another feet—nothing more… If we follow up in the same way on the other divisions mentioned, we find that we are deceived every time we believe we see sovereignty divided.…

**NEED FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, NOT REPRESENTATION**

It follows from the above that the general will is always in the right and inclines toward the public good, but it does not follow that the deliberations of the people always have the same rectitude. People always desire what is good, but they do not always see what is good. You can never corrupt the people, but you can often fool them, and that is the only time that the people appear to will something bad.…

If, assuming that the people were sufficiently informed as they made decisions… the general will would always be resolved from a great number of small differences, and the deliberation would always be good. But when blocs are formed, associations of parts at the expense of the whole, the will of each of these associations will be general as far as its members are concerned but particular as far as the State is concerned. Then we may say that there are no longer so many voters as there are men present but as many as there are associations. The differences will become less numerous and will yield less general results. Finally, when one of these associations becomes so strong that it dominates the others, you no longer have the sum of minor differences as a result but rather one single [unresolved] difference, with the result that there no longer is a general will, and the view that prevails is nothing but one particular view.…

It is agreed that everything which each individual gives up of his power, his goods, and his liberty under the social contract is only that part of all those things which is of use to the community, but it is also necessary to agree that the sovereign alone is the judge of what that useful part is.…

Government… is wrongly confused with the sovereign, whose agent it is. What then is government? It is an intermediary body established between the subjects and the sovereign to keep them in touch with each other. It is charged with executing the laws and maintaining both civil and political liberty.… The only will dominating government… should be the general will or the law. The government’s power is only the public power vested in it. As soon as [government] attempts to let any act come from itself completely independently, it starts to lose its intermediary role. If the time should ever come when the [government] has a particular will of its own stronger than that of the sovereign and makes use of the public power which is in its hands to carry out its own particular will—when there are thus two sovereigns, one in law and one in fact—at that moment the social union will disappear and the body politic will be dissolved.

Once the public interest has ceased to be the principal concern of citizens, once they prefer to serve State with money rather than with their persons, the State will be approaching ruin.…

Sovereignty cannot be represented.… Essentially, it consists of the general will, and a will is not represented: either we have it itself, or it is something else; there is no other possibility. The deputies of the people thus are not and cannot be its representatives. They are only the people’s agents and are not able to come to final decisions at all. Any law that the people have not ratified in person is void, it is not a law at all.
Jean Jaques Rousseau, Emile or On Education

Man should not be alone. Emile is now a man. We have promised him a companion; we must give her to him. That companion is Sophie.

Sophie should be a woman as Emile is a man. That is to say, she should have everything that suits the constitution of her species and of her sex so as to take her place in the physical and moral order. Let us begin, therefore, by examining the similarities and differences between her sex and ours.

In all that does not relate to sex, woman is man. She has the same organs, the same needs, the same faculties. The machine is constructed in the same manner, the parts are the same, the workings of the one are the same as the other, and the appearance of the two is similar. From whatever aspect one considers them, they differ only by degree.

In the union of the sexes, each alike contributes to the common end but not in the same way. From this diversity springs the first difference which may be observed in the moral relations between the one and the other. The one should be active and strong, the other passive and weak. It is necessary that the one have the power and the will; it is enough that the other should offer little resistance.

Once this principle is established it follows that woman is specially made to please man. If man ought to please her in turn, the necessity is less urgent. His merit is in his power; he pleases because he is strong. This is not the law of love, I admit, but it is the law of nature, which is older than love itself.

If woman is made to please and to be subjected, she ought to make herself pleasing to man instead of provoking him. Her strength is in her charms; by their means she should compel him to discover his strength and to use it.

There is no parity between the two sexes when it comes to the consequence of sex. The male is only a male in certain instances; the female is female all her life or at least all her youth. Everything reminds her of her sex, and to fulfill well her functions she needs a constitution that relates to them. She needs care during pregnancy and rest when her child is born; she must have a quiet, sedentary life while she nurses her children; their education calls for patience and gentleness, for a zeal and affection which nothing can dismay. She serves as a liaison between them and their father; she alone can make him love them and give him the confidence to call them his own. What tenderness and care is required to maintain a whole family as a unit! And finally all this must not come from virtues but from feelings without which the human species would soon be extinct.

Once it is demonstrated that men and women neither are nor ought to be constituted the same, either in character or in temperament, it follows that they ought not to have the same education. . . . After having tried to form the natural man, in order not to leave our work incomplete let us see how to also to form the woman who suits this man.

Prevent young girls from getting bored with their tasks and infatuated with their amusements. . . . A little girl who is fond of her mother or her friend will work by her side all day without getting tired; the chatter alone will make up for any loss of liberty. But . . . children who take no delight in their mother’s company are not likely to turn out well . . . . They are flatterers and deceitful and soon learn to conceal their thoughts. Neither should they be told that they ought to love their mother. Affection is not the result of duty, and in this respect constraint is out of place. Continual attachment, constant care, habit itself, all these will lead a child to love her mother as long as the mother does nothing to deserve the child’s hate. The very control she exercises over the child, if well directed, will increase rather than diminish the affection, for women being made for dependence, girls feel themselves made to obey.

For the same reason that they have, or ought to have, little freedom, they are apt to indulge themselves too fully with regard to such freedom as they do have. They carry everything to
extremes, and they devote themselves to their games with an enthusiasm even greater than that of boys. This enthusiasm must be kept in check, for it is the source of several vices commonly found among women -- caprice and that extravagant admiration which leads a woman to regard a thing with rapture to-day and to be quite indifferent to it to-morrow. Do not leave them for a moment without restraint.

This habitual restraint produces a docility which woman requires all her life, for she will always be in subjection to a man, or to man's judgment, and she will never be free to set her own opinion above his. What is most wanted in a woman is gentleness. Formed to obey a creature so imperfect as man, a creature often vicious and always faulty, she should early learn to submit to injustice and to suffer the wrongs inflicted on her by her husband without complaint. She must be gentle for her own sake, not his. Bitterness and obstinacy only multiply the sufferings of the wife and the misdeeds of the husband; the man feels that these are not the weapons to be used against him. Heaven did not make women attractive and persuasive that they might degenerate into bitterness, or meek that they should desire the mastery; their soft voice was not meant for hard words, nor their delicate features for the frowns of anger. When they lose their temper they forget themselves. Often enough they have just cause of complaint; but when they scold they always put themselves in the wrong. Each should adopt the tone that befits his or her sex. A too gentle husband may make his wife impertinent, but unless a man is a monster, the gentleness of a woman will bring him around and sooner or later will win him over.

I would not altogether blame those who would restrict a woman to the labours of her sex and would leave her in profound ignorance of everything else. But that would require either a very simple, very healthy public morality or a very isolated life style. In large cities, among immoral men, such a woman would be too easily seduced. Her virtue would too often be at the mercy of circumstances. In this philosophic century, virtue must be able to be put to the test. She must know in advance what people might say to her and what she should think of it. The search for abstract and speculative truths, for principles and axioms in science, for all that tends to wide generalization, is beyond a woman's grasp; their studies should be thoroughly practical. It is their business to apply the principles discovered by men, it is their place to make the observations which lead men to discover those principles... For the works of genius are beyond her reach, and she has neither the accuracy nor the attention for success in the exact sciences... Woman has more wit, man more genius; woman observes, man reasons. Together they provide the clearest light and the profoundest knowledge which is possible to the unaided human mind -- in a word, the surest knowledge of self and of others of which the human race is capable. In this way art may constantly tend to the perfection of the instrument which nature has given us.
**STUDY GUIDE: The Scientific Revolution**

The “natural philosophers” of the early modern period believed that true knowledge comes from experience. The *scientific method* was designed as a system for collecting empirical evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deductive Reasoning</th>
<th>Inductive Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Descartes)</em></td>
<td><em>(Bacon)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bacon & Descartes were instrumental in creating a system of inquiry to establish objective truth known as the *scientific method*.

**“Natural Philosophers” of the Scientific Revolution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosopher</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Contribution(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descartes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absolute monarchs established Royal ________________ in order to promote scientific inquiry. These monarchs were not interested in scientific advancement for its own sake, but in the possibilities scientific inquiry had to produce wealth and new military technologies.

**The [British] Agricultural Revolution**: The application of ___________ principles and ___________ capitalism to agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E___________</th>
<th>I___________</th>
<th>S___________ Breeding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Replaced the ___________, where the whole community would plant crops and graze their livestock. | Jethro _____________  
The ___________ ____________, which mechanized sowing, was Tull's most famous invention. | The process of breeding animals with desirable characteristics together to produce genetically superior livestock |

**The Enlightenment**

**VALUES OF THE ENLIGHTENMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>SCIENCE</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
<th>LIBERTY</th>
<th>TOLERATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although enlightened ideals spread throughout Europe, ________________ was the epicenter of the Enlightenment.

**The French "Philosophes"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophe</th>
<th>Notable Published Work(s)</th>
<th>Contribution(s) to Enlightened Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voltaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diderot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montesquieu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousseau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enlightened Absolutism**

Monarchs in Central and Eastern Europe took an interest in the ideals of the Enlightenment, using them to modernize and consolidate power.

(Austria) ________________

The ____________ ambitious, but the ____________ successful of the enlightened despots.

Lifted restrictions on ____________.

(Russia) ________________

Raised to the throne after participating in a conspiracy to assassinate her husband

Purchased ____________’s library and paid him to be the librarian

______________’s Rebellion

Freedom-limiting Institutions *in the eyes of the philosophes*:

Most *philosophes* were *anticlerical* (against the influence of a hierarchical, institutional Church organization – not necessarily against the general concept of religion) in their thinking.

“And his hand would plait the priest’s entrails, For want of a rope, to strangle kings.” – Diderot

**Natural Religion** *(e.g., ____________)*

Knowledge of God comes from:

God exists. He created an orderly universe and made it possible for human beings to understand him through the use of **observation** and **reason**.

**Revealed Religion** *(e.g., ____________)*

Knowledge of God comes from:

- Sacred texts claiming to contain the revealed word of God
- Religious dogmas derived from said texts
- Miracles, prophecies and religious “mysteries”

Although the enlightened absolutists promoted religious toleration, education, and other benevolent reforms, they tended to promote these ideals only to the point to which the ideals furthered their goals. Ultimately, the enlightenment ideal of freedom would prove incompatible with absolute rule.