Kolbe Academy
Home School

GRADE TWELVE
UNITED STATES & MODERN HISTORY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Kolbe Academy
Home School

♦ SYLLABUS ♦

History
Grade 12

COURSE TITLE: United States and Modern History

COURSE TEXTS:

READER ❖ Kolbe Academy. *Modern History Reader*. Napa: Kolbe Academy Press, 2008. Print.

HISTORY ❖ Heffner, Richard D., and Alexander Heffner. *A Documentary History of the United States*. 8th ed. New York: Signet, 2009. Print.

FEDERALIST ❖ Hamilton, Alexander, James Madison and John Jay. *The Federalist Papers*. Ed. Clinton Rossiter. Introd. and notes Charles R. Kesler. New York: Signet Classic, 1999. Print.

DEMOCRACY ❖ De Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Ed. Richard D. Heffner. Abr. ed. New York: Signet Classic, 2010. Print.

MODERN ❖ Johnson, Paul. *Modern Times: The World from the Twenties to the Nineties*. Rev. ed. New York: Perennial Classics, 2001. Print.

MLA ❖ Modern Language Association of America. *MLA Handbook Eighth Edition*, 2016.

Study Guides I-IV ❖ Kolbe Academy. *Study Guide to the US & Modern History Course*: 4 Volumes: Kolbe Academy Press: Napa, 2014. Print.

COURSE DESRIPTION:

Thought shapes history. Man's thoughts are shaped by his beliefs, his habits (be they virtue or vice), his society, culture, custom, environment, experience, and education. Man shapes history through his choices, which are rooted in those soils of his thought. As you read the pages of modern history you will see that man's thought—beliefs and philosophies—are some of the most powerful forces on earth.

This course studies the major ideological trends of modern Western Civilization and their effects on the world. In this course students will be asked to examine the work of a number of thinkers—philosophers, scientists and theologians — in conjunction with their study of historical events and documents. In essence this is both a course in history and in political philosophy. It will be most fruitful to seriously consider the power of an idea in to shape history.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

This course will enable the student to:

- ❖ Identify major ideological and political trends
- ❖ Critically interpret political and philosophical rhetoric
- ❖ Analyze the implications of philosophical ideologies; and of political actions, policies and regimes

WEEKLY COURSE WORK:

1. Readings: approximately 50 pages per week
2. Accompanying study guide questions
3. Weekly papers; topics are listed in the Course Plan. These papers should be 1- 2 pages type-written, size 12 font, double-spaced or neatly handwritten in cursive. Each paper should be comprised of a strong introduction, body, and conclusion. See the *Weekly Paper Topics Answer Guide* for grading guidelines.
4. **Key Points** sections highlight the most important concepts that the student should know and consider.
5. Four Three-Part Exams: to assess the student's understanding and retention of material and concepts. These tests along with the test answer keys are provided in the Course Plan packet.

6. Students seeking Honors for this course must complete the readings, weekly papers, reading assignments, and exams as laid out in the course plan.

SKILLS TO BE DEVELOPED:

- Knowledge of the ideologies and major historical events of modern Western Civilization through a study of influential first hand sources
- Greater ability to distinguish truth from falsity
- Ability to identify rhetoric and distinguish between truth and mere rhetoric
- Ability to analyze ideas
- Ability to reason according to sound logic
- Ability to formulate and effectively communicate clear, logically sound arguments both in writing and speaking

DIPLOMA REQUIREMENTS:

Summa Cum Laude students must complete the entire Kolbe Academy proposed curriculum as written. Summa students must fulfill the requirements for the Kolbe Core (K) or Kolbe Honors (H) course as outlined in this History course plan. In 9th grade, ***Summa*** students must pursue the (H) designation in at least one of the following courses: Theology, Literature, or History. In 10th grade, ***Summa*** students must pursue the (H) designation in at least two of the following courses: Theology, English, Literature, or History. In 11th grade, ***Summa*** students must pursue the (H) designation in at least three of the following courses: Theology, English, Literature, or History. In 12th grade, ***Summa*** students must pursue the (H) designation in all of the following courses: Theology, English, Literature, and History. ***Magna Cum Laude*** and ***Standard*** diploma candidates may choose to pursue the (H) or (K) designation, but are not required to do so. If not pursuing either of those designations the parent has the option of altering the course plan as desired. ***Magna Cum Laude*** students must include 3 years of History in high school, include 1 year of World History and one year of American history. ***Standard*** diploma students must include 3 years of History in high school, including 1 year of World History and one year of American history.

KOLBE CORE (K) AND HONORS (H) COURSES:

- Students pursuing the **Kolbe Core (K)** designation should do all of the reading **except** those listed as HONORS or Supplemental. **Kolbe Core students need to complete at least 4 of the 14 weekly papers each semester;** they should have discussions or write informal essays in response to the rest of the weekly paper topics as these are major themes and will appear in some way on the exams.
- Students pursuing the **Kolbe Honors (H)** designations must do all of the readings. The readings listed as HONORS are done in addition to the rest of the assignments, not in lieu of them. Honors students are *not* required to read the supplemental readings. **Honors students need to complete 8 of the 14 weekly papers each semester;** they should have discussions or write informal essays in response to the rest of the weekly paper topics as these are major themes and will appear in some way on the exams.
- For students who are not seeking either the Kolbe Core (K) or Honors (H) designation for this course, parents may alter the course, as they so desire.

SEMESTER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS:

Designation*		**K**	**H**

Course Title	US & Modern History	US & Modern History	US & Modern History
Semester 1	Any 2 graded written work samples from Semester 1.	1. *Complete* Midterm 1 Exam 2. *Complete* Semester 1 Exam	1. *Complete* Midterm 1 Exam 2. *Complete* Semester 1 Exam 3. EIGHT Paper Topic Essays
Semester 2	Any 2 graded written work samples from Semester 2.	1. *Complete* Midterm 2 Exam 2. *Complete* Semester 2 Exam	1. *Complete* Midterm 2 Exam 2. *Complete* Semester 2 Exam 3. EIGHT Paper Topic Essays

***Designation refers to designation type on transcript. K designates a Kolbe Academy Core course. H designates a Kolbe Academy Honors course.**

The Kolbe academic advisor will verify that the required work was completed successfully and award the Kolbe Core (K) or Honors (H) designation. The Kolbe academic advisor has the final decision in awarding the designation for the course. **If no designation on the transcript is desired, parents may alter the lesson plan in any way they choose and any written sample work is acceptable to receive credit for the course each semester.** If you have any questions regarding what is required for the (K) or (H) designations or diploma type status, please contact the academic advising department at 707-255-6499 ext. 5 or by email at advisors@kolbe.org.

SCOPE AND SEQUENCE:

FIRST SEMESTER

I. New Modes and Orders: Machiavelli
II. The Scientific Revolution
III. Europe: 1565-1685 - Religious Warfare and the Ascent of Absolutism and Nationalism
IV. 17th Century England: From the Civil War to the Glorious Revolution
V. The Nascence of Modern Political Theory: Thomas Hobbes and John Locke
VI. Rise of Modern Economic Theory: Adam Smith
VII. Political Philosophy during the Enlightenment: Jean Jacques Rousseau
VIII. America: A New Beginning
IX. The Development of the Colonies and the Move Toward Unification
X. English Abuses and American Responses
XI. America Breaks Free
XII. Europe in Turmoil: The French Revolution
XIII. Early Formation of a New Nation
XIV. The Founding of the United States of America

SECOND SEMESTER

I. Growth of a New Nation
II. Religion, Liberty and Democracy
III. Preventing Democratic Despotism
IV. The Changing American Landscape
V. Changes Abroad
VI. The Civil War
VII. Booming Business in America: The Late 19th Century
VIII. World War I

IX. Post War Economics & Modern Man
X. The End of Isolationism & The Rise of Stalin
XI. Nazi Germany & The Cold War
XII. The 1960s & Concluding WWII
XIII. 1970s – The Decade of Turmoil
XIV. Conservatism in the West & The Communist Regime of Mao Tse-Tung in the Far East

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS:

- Warren Carroll,
  - *The Rise and Fall of the Communist Revolution*
  - ---, *1917*
  - ---, *The Founding of Christendom*
  - ---, *Conquest of Darkness*

COURSE PLAN METHODOLOGY:

- It is recommended that this course be taken in conjunction with the 12th grade Theology course.
- Be sure to reference the introductory portions and glossaries of your textbooks. They are full of valuable information and helps for understanding the texts.
- Family discussions on the materials and lessons are highly effective means to foster deeper considerations of the materials. Use the *Key Points* from the course plan, the paper topics and study guide questions as a basis to start these discussions at home with your students.

♦♦♦ FIRST SEMESTER ♦♦♦

WEEK 1		
READER	**New Modes and Orders: Machiavelli**	The Prince, Niccolo Machiavelli Chapters 6-9, 15-18, 26
Study Guide	*Volume I*	Week One Questions
Paper Topic	Using the following quote as the basis for Machiavelli's view of human nature, discuss why it is necessary that the prince must operate the way that he does. Make sure to use specific examples from the text to explain your position. "Because this is to be asserted in general of men, that they are ungrateful, fickle, false, cowardly, covetous, and as long as you succeed they are yours entirely; they will offer you their blood, property, life, and children, as is said above, when the need is far distant; but when it approaches they turn against you." (Machiavelli, The Prince, Book XVII)	

Niccolo Machiavelli's (1469-1527) works, particularly The Prince and Discourses on Livy were groundbreaking in the history of western civilization, particularly as a bridge between the Greek, Roman, and Medieval outlook with the modern world. Coming out of the Italian Renaissance of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, Machiavelli's ideas paved the way for the emergence of religious wars, royal absolutism, constitutionalism, the French Revolution, nationalism, communism, fascism and the modern administrative state. The political fabric of the modern world can be directly traced back to his ideas.

Key Points

To understand the context of The Prince, Machiavelli's seminal work, it is important to discuss the historical circumstances that precipitated this earthshaking book. As Europe emerged out of the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance, Christendom was beginning to disintegrate. The power of the papacy was increasingly challenged by political and religious groups in an attempt to break the Church's influence over civil society. The calamitous fourteenth century, filled with wars and plagues (particularly the Black Death), brought about a fundamental restructuring of society that essentially buried the ordered feudal and political society that had characterized the Middle Ages. The gradual emergence of nationalism and the nation-state with the Hundred-Years War between England and France intensified the already contentious power struggle between secular kingdoms and the papacy.

Meanwhile, the Renaissance's "rediscovery" of the Greek and Roman classics chipped away at the medieval emphasis on man's soul and the afterlife. The emergence of secular humanism, although not inherently contradictory to Catholic teaching, began to focus more and more attention on human accomplishments and endeavors not related to the salvation of man's eternal soul. The Italian people, although still divided into numerous kingdoms, duchies, and republics, began to yearn for a united Italy as it had existed during the Roman Empire. It was in this tumultuous hotbed of intellectual and political change that Machiavelli wrote The Prince.

Book VI of The Prince begins with Machiavelli speaking of the founding of new principalities or regimes. He argues that princes must aim high in founding and ruling their regimes, not because they ought to have their regime mirror the City of God as had been the case in the medieval world, but because by doing so they can attain their earthly goal of retaining power. Being a successful ruler, Machiavelli argues, consists in possessing a good combination of virtue and fortune, the former being the most important ingredient in a successful regime. **It is important to note that the virtue Machiavelli speaks of is not the classical and medieval idea of virtue, but the virtue of good statesmanship.** He cites Moses, Cyrus, Romulus, and Theseus as

examples of men who have ruled well due to virtue.

Hinting at his own agenda, Machiavelli states that the founding of new modes and orders is the most difficult human endeavor. In instituting new regimes, princes will have to counter the opposition from traditional sectors of society such as the Church and the nobility. In order to deal with this opposition, rulers must ruthlessly squelch it in order for their regime to survive. This is because keeping subjects convinced of their power and authority is a difficult thing to do. Thus Machiavelli concludes that armed prophets triumph while unarmed prophets fail. The ability and readiness to use force to retain power is crucial to his amoral philosophy.

Rule through virtue and fortune is continued as a theme by Machiavelli in Book VII. He spends a great deal of time speaking well of Cesare Borgia, the illegitimate son of Pope Alexander VI, who obtained his power through fortune. Cesare is to be praised, argues Machiavelli, because he exhibited the characteristics of an armed prophet, a man who relies neither on the arms or fortune of others, at least initially. Quite telling of Machiavelli's thought is the story of Remirro de Orco, a cruel and ruthless man whom Cesare Borgia placed in charge of the province of Romagna. De Orco's brutality and excessive force were instrumental in pacifying the seemingly ungovernable province. In a further twist, Borgia ended up having de Orco killed and displayed gruesomely in public view. De Orco's role of pacification being completed, Borgia was able to gain popularity from the people of Romagna by eliminating their feared ruler. Thus, not only did Borgia pacify Romagna without taking the blame for it, but he also was loved by his people even more. In the end, however, Borgia's reign was a failure since his father, Alexander VI, died before Borgia had consolidated his power thus rendering him a victim of fortune and ultimately, a failure.

Book VIII deals with Machiavelli's criticism of Agathocles the Sicilian, King of Syracuse. It may come as a surprise to the student that Machiavelli is immensely critical of a man who used brutality to gain and retain his position of power. Specifically, Machiavelli criticizes Agathocles' use of brutality that garnered him much hatred. After all, a good prince ought not to constantly fear for his life. Instead, Machiavelli argues, he should have used his cruelty so that he would gain fear and respect, not hatred. Machiavelli then concludes that cruelty, by its very nature, is a morally neutral concept. It can be used for useful or detrimental purposes in the political regime.

In Book IX, Machiavelli discusses the two groups from which a ruler derives his power: the people and the nobility. Since the nobility are quite often the equal of or greater than the prince in cunning and intelligence, it behooves him to derive his support from the people. Unlike the nobility who desire to dominate others, the people simply wish to be free from excessive domination and cruelty. Given that the people are greater in number than the nobility, it is advantageous for the prince to have the people on his side. As long as the prince has the virtue to rule his people, he can effectively maintain his authority. (Remember virtue for Machiavelli is effective statesmanship, not moral virtue.) Machiavelli's choice of the people over the nobility has had far-reaching consequences. Given that the vast majority of kings in the Middle Ages ruled effectively only with the consent of the nobility, the decision to choose the people is truly revolutionary. Although there are exceptions to this rule in ancient history (The Gracchi Brothers in Rome), this political realignment in history helps to pave the way for the development of constitutionalism and modern liberal democracy.

Book XV of The Prince is an implicit rejection of Plato's Republic, Aristotle's Politics, and St. Augustine's City of God. According to Machiavelli, he is not writing about how to create and govern imaginary republics or regimes based on a flawed understanding and expectations of human nature possessed by the classical and medieval thinkers. He sees things as they are, that men are inherently wicked, possessing no goodness in them, an idea that runs contrary to the Catholic understand of human nature as flawed but not totally depraved. It is interesting to note that Martin Luther and John Calvin, the vanguards of the Protestant

Reformation, essentially agree with Machiavelli in their understanding of human nature as totally depraved. Given the realities of man's nature, according to Machiavelli, it is then necessary for the prince to learn how to be good and wicked according to political expediency.

Having set up the introduction for his topic in Book XV, Machiavelli discusses two qualities in a ruler in Book XVI: liberality (or generosity) and stinginess. Although it would be ideal to have a good balance of both, the prince should strive to avoid excessive liberality and to embrace stinginess. Having the reputation of liberality makes the citizenry expect a great deal from the prince, an expectation that cannot be maintained in time of war or great economic distress. If one must be generous to his subjects, he must be liberal in giving away things that are not his own. In other words, be generous as long as it doesn't hurt his own standing. Thus, it is preferable for the prince to possess stinginess, which, although it may not make him popular, will allow him to maintain his regime while avoiding hatred from his subjects.

Whether a prince should desire to be feared or loved by his subjects is the topic of Book XVII. As one should be figuring out by this point, Machiavelli believes it would be best to possess both qualities if possible according to the dictates of political reality. However, if one must choose between the two, it is better to be feared (not hated, though) rather than loved. Since men are inherently evil by nature, the ruler must instill fear in his subjects. By doing this, he avoids potential rebellion and unrest in the kingdom. A prince who always wishes to be loved and governs according to this wish will not be taken seriously by his subjects. He will be perceived as weak, ineffective, and vulnerable. Machiavelli cites the example of Hannibal who effectively maintained control over the Carthaginian army by instilling fear and respect in them, using some harsh measures when necessary. Scipio's wish to be loved by his soldiers, on the other hand, caused them to revolt against his rule due to their perception of his weakness.

Interestingly enough, Machiavelli turns to the subject of the faith of the prince in Book XVIII. Religion is the most important quality that a prince ought to possess. Not that the prince himself should be personally pious, but that he should possess the appearance of piety and religiosity. Since personal piety and faith will stand in the way of effective rule, it is nonetheless necessary that the prince appears to be a man of faith for the stability of his regime. Doubtless Machiavelli was well versed enough in classical and medieval history to see the immense importance of religion to the maintenance of a well-ordered society, but only as a means of maintaining political power through appearances.

The final paragraph in Book XVIII contains perhaps the most famous passage in The Prince, a statement that has had long-lasting and devastating consequences for human history. The prince, in order to be an effective ruler, must always be aiming for the correct end result which then justifies the means to attain this result. In other words, the end justifies the means. As long as power is maintained, the prince will be judged as a success in the world.

The seeds of emerging Italian nationalism, a prominent topic in nineteenth century European history, are prominent in Book XXVI, the final chapter of The Prince. Ever since the dissolution of the western Roman Empire in 476 A.D., the Italian peninsula had been a collection of relatively weak and ineffective kingdoms and republics. Their weakness left them vulnerable to foreign domination from the emerging nation-states of France and, Spain, as well as the Holy Roman Empire and the secular power of the papacy and its corresponding Papal States. Given that Machiavelli was writing toward the end of the Italian Renaissance, an era that extolled the glory of former days, particularly the Roman Empire, it is not surprising that he would be heavily influenced by these ideas which would have a strong likelihood of being palatable to the educated elite of Italy. Machiavelli's new modes and orders are all aimed at giving a prince in Italy the opportunity to utilize these ideas in the pursuit of Italy's return to glory. He believed that only with a strong and effective leader could Italy hope to overthrow its barbarian occupiers and the secular power of the Catholic Church.

In conclusion, it is very important for the student to realize just how incompatible Machiavelli's political, philosophical, and theological ideas are with the teachings of the Catholic Church. Principally, Machiavelli is opposed to the Church's understanding of human nature and the morality that derives from it. While the Church believes that man's original goodness has been tarnished by the stain of original sin, it still maintains that man is essentially good while possessing the inclination towards evil. This evil must be checked by the power of the church and government. Machiavelli, on the other hand, sees man's nature as inherently wicked, totally depraved, and incapable of any goodness. (The concept of grace is completely absent in The Prince.) Machiavelli does not preach "do unto others as you would have them do unto you," but rather "if men treat you wickedly, treat them wickedly in return." Since Machiavelli rejects Catholic morality, and by doing so rejects the limits to power that exist according to the natural law, he recognizes no natural limits to power whatsoever. The pure dictates of practical political considerations and maintenance of power at all costs replace the natural law in Machiavelli's regime.

Discuss:

- How does Machiavelli's view of human nature lead to his conclusions in The Prince?
- How did the emerging nationalism of the Late Middle Ages and the ideas of the Renaissance play a role in Machiavelli's thought?
- Why are Machiavelli's political teachings "new modes and orders"?
- Discuss the difference between ruling by virtue or by fortune. Discuss the example of Cesare Borgia as a man who ruled by fortune but did not possess the virtue to retain his kingdom.
- Why must the prince not imitate the example of Agathocles, King of Syracuse?
- Why should the prince derive his consent from the people rather than the nobility?
- How is Machiavelli's political philosophy radically different from the classical and medieval view? (Hint: Human Nature)
- Why must a prince choose to be feared rather than loved?
- Why is religion the most important quality that a prince must possess?
- Explain the implications of Machiavelli's idea that the ends justify the means in politics.
- Discuss the implications of Machiavelli's final chapter for the emerging nationalism in Europe.
  In a very general sense, discuss the many ways in which Machiavelli's political revolution is contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church that had developed to its height philosophically with the writings of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

Notes

WEEK 2		
READER	**The Scientific Revolution**	1. "On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres," Copernicus 2. "Letter to Madame Christina of Lorraine Grand Duchess of Tuscany," Galileo Galilei 3. "Letter on Galileo's Theories," St. Robert Bellarmine 4. "Discourse on Method," Descartes
Study Guide	*Volume I*	Week Two Questions
Paper Topic	Write a paper on the following theme: The clash between science and religion is most clearly demonstrated in the Catholic Church's conflict with Galileo's scientific findings. Compare and contrast Galileo's argument in Letter to Madame Christina of Lorraine to St. Robert Bellarmine's Letter on	

	Galileo's Theories. Which one do you find more convincing and why? Make sure to use quotes from your sources to back up your arguments.

Key Points

While Machiavelli launched a political revolution that would dramatically reshape the course of modern European history, the Scientific Revolution, beginning with the publication of Nicolaus Copernicus' On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres in 1543, had far-reaching consequences as well. The Scientific Revolution that began in the mid sixteenth century was a radical break with the Aristotelian and Ptolemaic tradition that had dominated intellectual life in Europe from the classical era through the end of the Middle Ages. Aristotle and Ptolemy, both ancient Greek thinkers, argued quite convincingly that the earth was the center of the universe. According to Ptolemy, planets revolved around the Earth at equal speeds and in perfect circular motion. This idea harmonized quite well with the scholastic thinkers of the High Middle Ages who incorporated Aristotelian and Ptolemaic science into their all-encompassing ordered world view.

The essential elements that composed earthly bodies were composed of earth, wind, fire, and water according to Aristotle. All heavenly bodies were composed of a matter called *ether* and were incorruptible unlike earthly objects. Like Ptolemaic astronomy, Aristotelian science remained enshrined in Catholic culture through scholasticism.

The publication after his death of Copernicus' On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres in 1543, shattered the classical and medieval scientific view of a geocentric universe and ushered in the Scientific Revolution. Nicolaus Copernicus, (1473-1543), a Polish scientist and Catholic priest, theorized that the sun, not the earth, was the center of the universe. Planets revolved around the sun in elliptical, not circular, motions and they moved at different speeds. Although this idea may appear to be common knowledge today and widely accepted, heliocentricity was highly revolutionary and, according to some, a dangerous proposition. Copernicus, having the foresight to predict possible controversy, went out of his way in On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres to argue that his scientific discoveries were not contradictory in the least with the Catholic faith.

Copernicus' forward in On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres makes it clear that he knows just how controversial his scientific findings are. In his dedication to Pope Paul III, he makes sure to stress the Catholic teaching, as expressed by St. Thomas Aquinas, that true faith and reason (or science) do not contradict. It is his pursuit of the truth in all things that has motivated the publishing of his findings, not the desire to subvert objective theological and philosophical truth. He cites various bishops who urged him to publish his findings as evidence that he is not a lone radical with an agenda against the Church. Also, he makes sure to point out that his ideas are rooted in classical tradition. Cicero and Plutarch, Copernicus argued, made similar arguments for a heliocentric universe. Consequently, Copernicus was not advocating, a radical new view but a carefully concluded observation of the stars consistent with prior scientific findings published by Greek and Roman thinkers.

It is important to note that Copernicus was, by all historical accounts, a faithful Catholic who went out of his way not to contradict the teachings of the Church or the accepted scientific knowledge of his day. He was merely positing his conclusion as a scientific theory, not the gospel truth. His decision to withhold publication of On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres shows that he did not want to unnecessarily stir up trouble. Upon publication in 1543, Copernicus' work created a bit of a stir but remained essentially a theoretical and scientific work that did not shake up or challenge the accepted science of the day.

Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), an Italian astronomer, is considered one of the most important if not one of the most controversial figures in the Scientific Revolution. Galileo's study of the stars had led him to agree

with Copernicus' findings published fifty years earlier. His publication of The Starry Messenger in 1610 posited the theory of Copernican heliocentricity as scientific fact. It was at this point, that Galileo began to run into trouble.

Since scholasticism, and by its very nature, Aristotelianism, was the dominant school of thought in the Church at the beginning of the seventeenth-century, Galileo's published findings were problematic. It seemed to the scholastic thinkers in the Church at this time, that Galileo was contradicting the Bible and writings of the Church fathers by teaching as gospel truth that the sun, not the earth, was the center of the universe. As long as heliocentricity remained merely a theory, there was no danger. But Galileo's positing of heliocentricity as objective truth was highly suspect. When noted religious figures in the Church began to read and accept Galileo's findings in The Starry Messenger, trouble ensued.

It is important put this into perspective in order to understand the caution on the part of Church. The past hundred years had been full of turmoil brought about by the Protestant Reformation's challenge of Church authority over the interpretation of Sacred Scripture, therefore it was not unreasonable that the Church was suspicious of Galileo's scientific discoveries. Since these discoveries appeared to contradict Scripture and the Church fathers, it would appear reasonable that the Church should have some reservations about allowing widespread dissemination of these ideas. The last thing the Church wanted on their hands at this point would be further undermining of the Bible and its authority to interpret scripture. For this reason, many in the Church hierarchy began to label Galileo's findings as heretical.[1]

Galileo defended himself against the charges of heresy in his Letter to Madame Christina of Lorraine Grand Duchess of Tuscany, a lengthy diatribe against his purported "harassment" from Church officials. While the letter itself makes some very good observations, its general tone is quite arrogant and confrontational. It leads one to believe that the problem lay less in Galileo's scientific discoveries, than in his aggressive and less-than-humble approach to Church authority.

Throughout his Letter to Madame Christina of Lorraine, Galileo repeatedly asserted that there is no contradiction between his published findings confirming Copernican heliocentricity and the teachings of the Church. He goes out of his way to argue that he is not attempting to undermine the Church's authority to interpret scripture on theological matters. However, regarding scientific matters, Galileo bluntly questions the Church's authority to interpret the Scriptures on matters not related to faith and salvation. He quotes extensively from St. Augustine, one of the greatest doctors of the Church, to substantiate his claims. Also, like Copernicus before him, he uses the authority of Greek and Roman science to bolster his findings.

Scholasticism, which advocated a harmony between Aristotelian science and the divine revelation through Scripture and Tradition, still remained highly dominant in the Church in the early seventeenth century. Since Aristotelian science, particularly the idea that the earth was the center of the universe, seemed eminently compatible with revealed truth, Galileo's undermining of Aristotle was seen as an attack on revealed truth and the authority of the Church. To try to settle this matter, St. Robert Bellarmine wrote a letter to Paolo

[1] At this point you can glimpse some of the Wisdom of God in entrusting the interpretation of Holy Writ to the Church rather than personal interpretation. Though the Lord works through human beings and their human efforts to reason through, explain and teach the meaning of the Scriptures, He only promises assurance of infallibility in teaching to the Church. That does not mean to individuals in the Church (with the exception of the Pope of course) but to the Magisterium and the Pope, when giving an official teaching on the subject at hand. Individuals within the Church are free to disagree and debate on subjects that the Church has not definitively defined, and those individuals may be right or wrong, even saints such as St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure disagreed on matters of faith that had not in their day been clearly defined. No individual in the Church, bishop—priest—nor even saint, was promised the gift of infallible knowledge, understanding or teaching; only the Church and her Supreme Pontiff were.

Foscarini, a Carmelite provincial who was advocating Galileo's ideas, regarding this very matter. In his Letter on Galileo's Theories written in 1615, Bellarmine noted that the teaching of heliocentricity as theory is not problematic. The problem lies, however, in teaching *as fact* that the sun is the center of the heavens. One must proceed with caution, argued Bellarmine, with such ideas that seem at odds with the Scriptural interpretation of the Church fathers.

Ultimately, Galileo was put on trial by the Church and recanted of his belief in dogmatic heliocentricity. Copernicus' On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres was placed on the Index of Forbidden Books and the crisis was solved for the time being. Now that further scientific discovery has confirmed some (but not all) of Galileo's findings, his standing among Church officials, particularly the late Pope John Paul II, has been somewhat rehabilitated. Although to the modern man, Galileo's silencing seems almost foolish and dictatorial, given the historical circumstances of the early seventeenth century, the threat to Church authority was perceived as being very real. With the waning dominance of scholasticism in the Church over the last four hundred years, Galileo's findings are seen by most in the Church today to be mostly compatible with revealed truth.

The Scientific Revolution turned in a decidedly more radical direction with the writings of Francis Bacon and Rene Descartes. Francis Bacon (1561-1626), an English intellectual, was raised in post-Catholic England following the English Reformation and King Henry VIII's break from Rome. Whereas Copernicus and Galileo had utilized science to more fully understand and explain God's creation, Bacon argued that science as it existed in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century was fundamentally flawed. It was perverted by preconceived prejudices, superstitions, religion, and the prior scholastic understanding of the universe, he argued. Bacon believed passionately that science could alleviate man's miserable state in life if only its secrets could be unlocked. For this reason he argued in his work *Novum Organum* for a complete overhaul of the scientific method. He urged that all preconceived notions about God, man, and the universe be thrown out and that all matters should be either proved or disproved using his inductive method. [How can science tell us about those truths about God that we only know through revelation? And, how can science tell us the answer to those truths about man and his meaning, which do not belong to the realm of physical realities that can be measured and observed with the senses?]

The inductive method advocated by Bacon urged a rigorous study of all particulars in order to reach the universal conclusion. In other words, man can induce certain universal truths from his scientific study of multiple subjects. The key problems with Bacon's philosophy of science lie in its overpowering reliance on human reason and understanding. Given the Christian view of man as fallen, it would seem to contradict Bacon's almost limitless belief in man's inherent reasoning abilities and the power of science to transform man's state in life. Also, by dispatching with all prior belief in revealed truth, Bacon encourages doubt in revealed truth and in the authority of the Church.

Rene Descartes (1596-1650), a Frenchmen credited as the founder of modern philosophy, derived many of his ideas on science from Francis Bacon. Like Bacon, he too believed that true scientific research and progress had been corrupted by the superstitions of medieval scholasticism. Having the proper scientific method became for Descartes, (as it did for Bacon), the primary focus of philosophic inquiry.

Descartes' Discourse on Method published in 1637 was a key text of the Scientific Revolution. Descartes began his work by positing that every man equally possesses the ability to properly reason. Right from the beginning, it is evident that Descartes shared Bacon's overly optimistic faith in human reason, one of the hallmarks of the emerging Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. The concept of man's fallen nature, once again, does not figure into Descartes' philosophy. This caused him to conclude that the differences of opinion on fundamental philosophical questions between philosophers throughout the ages had nothing to do with

nature but with an improper scientific method. If everybody abandoned their preconceived notions and employed the scientific method, all would become clear. Like Bacon, Descartes' philosophy began with doubting all prior revealed truth.

Descartes' is well known for advocating the deductive method in his Discourse on Method. Unlike Bacon's inductive method, which starts with observations of particulars to reach a general conclusion, Descartes' deductive method begins with one universal truth: "I think therefore I am." In other words, his existence is predicated on (or on account of) his thinking. From this truth, Descartes is able to determine other universal truths such as his idea of man as a reasoning being composed of body and soul and the existence and power of God. Descartes' knowledge of his own existence then spurs him on to the discovery of the knowledge of particulars, which, in theory, ought to confirm his first universal principle.

The most pernicious aspect of Descartes' philosophy, however, is his conclusion that mankind can reach the knowledge of everything that there is to know. By placing no limits on man's acquisition of knowledge, Descartes essentially gives mankind godly abilities. The elevation of man's place in the world, beginning most notably with the Renaissance, reaches another height with Descartes' philosophy. Whereas the Bible states, "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!" (Romans 11:33), Descartes contradicts this idea.

With the advent of Bacon and Descartes' philosophy, the Scientific Revolution progressed in a new fashion. While Galileo may have gone a bit too far in his questioning of Church authority, Bacon and Descartes begin their philosophy with doubt in all revealed truth. The arrogant assumptions of Baconian and Cartesian philosophy, replete with their optimistic view of human nature, distrust of all authority, and reliance on science exclusively paved the way for the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century.

The Scientific Revolution's influence on this history of Western civilization, both positively and negatively, is unarguable. The research conducted by Copernicus and Galileo have confirmed, for the most part, the scientific accuracy of a heliocentric universe. The clashes between Galileo and the Church illustrate the conflict that can exist between faith and science. Likewise, Francis Bacon and Rene Descartes' inductive and deductive scientific methods greatly influenced the direction of modern philosophy. In the end, the Scientific Revolution can be considered, along with the Renaissance and Protestant Reformation, one of the defining historical movements of Western civilization.

Discuss:

- How did Copernicus differ in his understanding of the universe from the predominant Aristotelian science of his day?
- Why was the Church justified in being suspicious of Copernicus' and Galileo's ideas about the universe?
- What is the major thrust of Galileo's Letter to Madame Christina of Lorraine Grand Duchess of Tuscany? Does he make a convincing argument? Why or why not?
- Discuss Bellarmine's critique of Galileo. Does he make a convincing argument? Why or why not?
- Briefly describe the inductive method promoted by Francis Bacon.
- Compare and contrast Bacon's inductive method with Descartes' deductive method.
- Discuss how Bacon and Descartes' scientific philosophy conflicts with the teachings of the Church.

Notes

WEEK 3		
READER	**Europe: 1565-1685 Religious Warfare and the Ascent of Absolutism and Nationalism**	1. "Against the Spanish Armada" (1588), Queen Elizabeth I 2. "Defense of Liberty Against Tyrants" (1579), Anonymous 3. "The Edict of Nantes" (1598) 4. "The True Law of Free Monarchies", King James I 5. "Political Testament," Cardinal Richelieu 6. "On Social Order and Absolute Monarchy," Jean Domat 7. "The Court of Louis XIV, Duc de Saint," Simon 8. "Revocation of the Edict of Nantes" (1685), King Louis XIV
Study Guide	*Volume I*	Week Three Questions
Paper Topic	Compare and the contrast the arguments made by King James I in "The True Law of Free Monarchies" and the anonymous author of "Defense of Liberty Against Tyrants". Which side is more consistent with the Catholic position as you understand it?	

Key Points

By the end of the Council of Trent in 1563, the unity of medieval Christendom had been shattered. The emergence of secular humanism in the Renaissance and the religious and political consequences of the Protestant Reformation begun in 1517 had significantly disrupted the old order in Europe. Keen on using the religious and political tenets of the Reformation to their own advantage, Germanic princes sought to undermine the authority of the Church and the Holy Roman Empire governed by Emperor Charles V, (also King of Spain). Religious warfare between Catholic and Protestant kingdoms in Germany raged until the Treaty of Augsburg in 1555 recognized the principle of "cuius regio, eius religio" (whose region, his religion). In other words, the religion of the prince dictated the established religion of his kingdom.

The emerging powers of Spain, France, and England began to consolidate their territorial gains at home and abroad. The age of discovery in the late fifteenth century, beginning with Christopher Columbus' expeditions in the Caribbean and South America, spurred all three countries into a race for the wealth first acquired by Spain under the reign of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella. However, Spain's emergence as a European power began to be significantly threatened by the challenge to Holy Roman Emperor (and King of Spain) Charles V by Protestant German kingdoms following the Reformation. The alliance between the Spain and Austria however, both ruled by kings of the Hapsburg dynasty, was not sufficient to reacquire the Holy Roman Empire's lost territory. With the aforementioned Treaty of Augsburg in 1555, Protestant power remained intact in the Holy Roman Empire, further fracturing Europe and challenging the emergence of Spain.

Inspired by the successful challenge to Spanish power exhibited by Protestant Germanic kingdoms, the heavily Protestant territory of what is now known as the Netherlands revolted against Spanish control. Phillip II, who had assumed the throne following the abdication of Charles V, was a zealous Catholic intent on holding the line against further territorial expansion by Protestant forces. He was also oozing with confidence after his alliance had crushed the Ottoman Turks at the Battle of Lepanto in 1571 and saved Europe from the resurgent threat of Islam. His decision to launch a massive land war against the Dutch, however, failed. Holland would emerge as a strong and wealthy world power in the seventeenth century.

Phillip II's decision to invade England in 1588 would prove to be a costly endeavor. Phillip II's second wife, Mary, first daughter of King Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon, had died in 1558 before she had successfully restored Catholicism in England. Following Mary's death, Queen Elizabeth I assumed the throne, setting England on a course that would suppress Catholicism and further ensconce the Church of England

founded by King Henry VIII as the established religion of England. It is unarguable that religion played a major role in Phillip II's ordering of the Spanish naval fleet or "Armada" against the English in 1588. Queen Elizabeth I's speech to her naval forces against the Spanish Armada illustrates the religious nature of the conflict between Spain and England. The enormous defeat suffered by the Spanish at the hands of the English in 1588 dashed any hope for a return of England to Catholicism. Towards the end of the reign of Phillip II, Spain emerged weakened and vulnerable. Although they would later play a prominent role in the Thirty Years War (1618-1648), Spain's dominance was waning.

One of the most important developments in the period 1565-1685 in Europe was the emergence of France and the Bourbon dynasty that reached its height with the reign of King Louis XIV. Following the Reformation, France was torn apart by wars between the Catholic majority and a determined Huguenot (Calvinist Protestant) minority. Brutal atrocities were perpetrated by both sides in the conflict, the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572 being the most infamous. One if the most influential works that emerged out of this period was the anonymous Huguenot publication, "Defense of Liberty Against Tyrants" ("Vindiciae contra Tyrannos").

"Defense of Liberty Against Tyrants" declared, among other things, that the King could not rule with absolute power. Since all power derives from God, the King has a duty and responsibility to rule his subjects according to the law of God. When the King attempts to enforce his religion (Catholicism) upon his subjects, the people have the duty before God to disobey any such orders that might be considered contrary to the Gospel--as interpreted by French Protestants. What develops later on, however, is the assertion that the people have the authority to overthrow an "unjust" authority. While St. Thomas Aquinas cautiously endorsed rebellion as a last resort, the French Huguenots essentially throw caution to the wind and give the nobility, as the voice of the people, discretionary power to overthrow the monarch for a variety of reasons. It is interesting for the reader to note just how radical this pronouncement was for its time. Later on, in the Enlightenment, the challenge to monarchy would derive a goodly amount of arguments from this text.

Following King Henry IV's conversion from Protestantism to Catholicism, the House of Bourbon was allowed by the Catholic majority in France to rule. Henry IV's conversion also contributed to the establishment of the Edict of Nantes in 1598. The Edict of Nantes temporarily put a halt to the immense and bloody conflicts of the French Wars of Religion, granting the Huguenot minority a significant degree of religious toleration. However, the growth of the philosophy of absolutism and nationalism under King Louis XIII and King Louis XIV would eventually threaten the principles behind the Edict of Nantes.

During the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV in the seventeenth century, the concept of a unified and strong French nation began to take shape. Military conquests and legal mechanisms began to erode the principles of the Edict of Nantes. Under such powerful men like Cardinal Richelieu, first-minister to Louis XIII, the French monarchy eroded the power the nobility and the Huguenot minority. The emerging power of the Bourbon monarchs even usurped and controlled ecclesiastical appointments, such as the selection of bishops and cardinals. In this manner, the power of the French monarchy began to trump the papal authority in Rome. The reign of Louis XIV marked the high watermark of French monarchical power. Combining domestic lavish endeavors like the new royal palace at Versailles with unprecedented foreign military expansion, Louis XIV further established the unchallenged authority of the Bourbon dynasty over the nobility and the French people. Taxation and the cost of living increased tremendously during the reign of Louis XIV in order to pay for the king's domestic projects and military escapades.

Duc de Saint-Simon's account of "The Court of Louis XIV" paints the king as a lavish spender with an arrogant and haughty personality. While Saint-Simon's account is largely accurate by all accounts, exaggeration and creative liberties are most certainly prominent in the text. However, it remains one of the

few primary sources available to the historian from this period in European history.

With the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 which essentially suppressed the religious expression of the Huguenot minority, Louis XIV consolidated and centralized his power over France. More domestic and foreign spending continued. However, the lack of any effective check on Louis XIV's power meant that France accumulated a massive debt which would later snowball into the French Revolution of 1789.

While the Bourbon monarchy was increasing its authority and boundaries during the seventeenth century, Europe became embroiled in a major conflict from 1618 to 1648: the Thirty-Years War. The religious civil wars that existed in France and the Holy Roman on a local level eventually blew up into a conflict between the emerging powers of Europe. When the kingdom of Bohemia in Germany attempted to crown a Protestant king in the backyard of the Catholic-Hapsburg dominated Holy Roman Empire, war ensued between Bohemia and the Austrian Hapsburgs. Joining forces with the Austrians were the Spanish Hapsburgs. Spain and Austria initially scored a decisive victory against Bohemia but it was too late to avoid a major European conflict. Not wanting to allow Austria, (or in particular, Spain) to gain effective control over the majority of Europe and upset the balance of power, Catholic France allied with Protestant Sweden to thwart the Hapsburg alliance. It is important to note that the war did not strictly break down along Catholic and Protestant lines although it was certainly an important element. More importantly, France and Sweden wanted to maintain a balance of royal power in Europe.

France and Sweden's involvement would pay off. France's competitor, Spain failed to resurrect her stature that had been a hallmark of Spain during the reign of Phillip II. However, the Austrian Hapsburgs successfully asserted their dominance over a vast majority of Germanic kingdoms in Eastern Europe. The balance of power between France and Austria remained essentially equal. One of the most notable outcomes of the Thirty-Years War was that the principle of the Treaty of Augsburg, "cuius regio, eius religio" (whose region, his religion), was generally applied to the entirety of Europe with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. It marked, for the most part, the end of religious conflict between Catholics and Protestants on a grand scale.

Another major development of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the continued growth and influence of the political philosophy of absolutism. Monarchy, as it had existed in the Middle Ages, was known for being a limited form of political authority. There were many reasons for this. First, the right of a king to exercise rule over his people was seen as God-given. Consequently, there were limits to the authority of the medieval king since his power was seen as coming directly from God. The king had a responsibility before God not to abuse his legitimate authority. Secondly, the increasing power of the papacy had been an effective check on power-hungry and ambitious kings. The power of excommunication that the pope held over the king to punish him for egregious breaches of power kept the monarch's territorial aggrandizement at bay. Finally, the concept of common-law tradition and idea that the king ruled with the consent of the nobility effectively maintained a limited monarchy.

With the power of the Church and the nobility decreasing in the fifteenth century, kings successfully tested the limits of their authority. Military conquest and taxation increased at an unprecedented rate. The king's armies wrested vast amounts of land away from the nobility while the prestige of the king was increasing. The political philosophy of absolutism maintained by such famous figures as King James, Cardinal Richelieu, and King Louis XIV held that the king's authority was essentially unlimited by any earthly mechanism. In other words, the king's authority was absolute and rebellion was considered sinful.

King James I's "The True Law of Free Monarchies" embodies the political philosophy of absolutism more so than any other document from the era. James argues that monarchy is the best form of government since it most closely resembles God's rule over man. He paints the picture of a king as a loving father who rules his children with gentleness and, on occasion, severity for their own good. The example of the Old Testament

kings, argues James, proves that there has been from the Old Testament through the New Testament a consistent heavenly endorsement of monarchy. Thus, kingship is the form of government ordained by God. Consequently, the king's subjects do not have the authority to overthrow even a tyrannical king since he has been set on the throne by God. God, not the people, is to be the one and only judge of a king, even if he is a tyrant.

Cardinal Richelieu, King Louis XIII's first-minister, also promoted the philosophy of absolutism in his "Political Testament". Richelieu defended the persecution of French Huguenots and the erosion of the French nobility's power in the name of kingship. Richelieu's politics gained greater influence in the reign of King Louis XIV, recognized as the embodiment of absolutism. Jean Domat, a jurist in the court of Louis XIV, wrote at length to develop and justify absolutism in "On Social Order and Absolute Monarchy". Obedience to God and the king must be unquestioning, argues Domat. Echoing King James I's "True Law of Free Monarchies", he equates the king with being God's representative on earth (a further attack on the authority of God's true representative on earth, the Pope). Since the king derives power from God, whose power is absolute, the king's earthly power also must be absolute since he ought to pattern his rule after God. Absolutism, historically, would reach its zenith with the reign of King Louis XIV who successfully rid his kingdom of the Huguenot threat, made the nobility bow to his rule, and whose reckless spending and military escapades lead to the eventual downfall of the Bourbon dynasty. Without any earthly check on power, Louis XIV essentially ruled as a god on earth, unencumbered by tradition, the nobility, or the Church. Politically, absolutism's defense of the king's immense authority would have devastating consequences for the European continent in the centuries to come.

The period 1565-1685 in Europe saw the further erosion of medieval Christendom, bloody conflicts between Catholics and Protestants, and the growth of absolutism as the dominant political philosophy of the period. Spain, France, England, and Austria emerged as the dominant powers in Europe while the Holy Roman Empire continued to fracture. The philosophy of absolutism, however, would be successfully challenged in England with constitutionalism emerging victorious in the English Civil War and the Glorious Revolution of 1688.

Discuss:

- How did the Treaty of Augsburg attempt to resolve religious conflict between Catholics and Protestants?
- What political and religious reasons did Phillip II of Spain have for launching the Spanish Armada against England in 1588?
- What was so radical about the French Huguenot document "The Defense of Liberty Against Tyrants"?
- How did the French kings Louis XIII and Louis XIV increase their power and the power of their kingdoms? How was this a violation of the medieval tradition?
- What caused the Thirty-Years War to erupt, who were the major powers struggling against and with each other during the conflict, and what was the resolution of the Peace of Westphalia in 1648?
- Discuss the political philosophy of absolutism: What characterizes it, how is it a departure from medieval kingship, and how does the authority of the Pope suffer under such a system? What is the basic reason why it is essentially incompatible with Catholic Christianity?

Notes