

GLOBAL 10 ADV SUMMER PROJECT

Worth Two (2) Test Grades

The Enlightenment, also known as the Age of Reason, was a philosophical movement that took place primarily in Europe, and later, in North America, during the late 17th and early 18th century. Its participants thought they were illuminating human intellect and culture by pulling away from the antiquated notion of absolute monarchs. This movement spread across the Atlantic Ocean to spark revolutions in the United States, France and Latin America.

Your Assignment: *Write an essay that is five (5) pages in length, typed in Time New Roman 12-point font, and double spaced. You must develop and explain the links between the intellectual movement of the Enlightenment, and how it inspired conflicts within the Age of Revolution.*

Task:

- Discuss the conditions that existed in pre-revolutionary societies that inspired revolutionary leaders (Britain's 13 colonies **or** Absolutist France, **and** the Latin American colonies).
- Identify one Enlightenment ideal each from Locke, Montesquieu, and a **third Enlightenment Philosopher of your choice**. Use primary documents (those included in the packet and one based on your own research) to identify their ideals.
- Discuss how the concepts that you identified from the Enlightenment documents by Locke, Montesquieu and the **Enlightenment Philosopher that you chose** (not included in your packet) are reflected in the thoughts and actions of revolutionary political leaders by discussing how those ideas are promoted or supported by the revolutionary documents (# 3, 4, 5).
- You must discuss the examples of Latin America, and either the United States **or** France, but not both (no extra points for both).
- Limit quotes to 1-2 sentences or paraphrase. Emphasis should be on analysis and your understanding of the historical period.
- Include a **hard copy** of the primary document that you used to research the ideals of your chosen Enlightenment philosopher.
- Simple in-text citations are acceptable (Locke, 1689) - no works cited needed.
- You must thoroughly edit and proofread your paper before submitting it for a grade. Have at least one other person proofread and comment on your essay as part of the editing process.
- PLAGIARISM or any form of ACADEMIC DISHONESTY will not be tolerated. AI (chatGPT) is considered plagiarism and will result in a 0 grade with referral.
- No late submissions will be accepted.

****Must be submitted the First Friday of the New School Year -
Friday, September 5, 2025****

Any questions - email one of the Global 10ADV teachers:

jbutler@cornwallschools.com

mmedvedev@cornwallschools.com

cwhitton@cornwallschools.com

Summer Assignment Rubric	4	3	2	1
Do the introduction and conclusion have all the necessary elements?	Introduction is <i>original</i> , well written and contains a strong thesis statement. Conclusion is more than a restatement of the introduction and is appropriate in length.	Introduction may be a restatement of the essay task but includes an appropriate thesis statement. Conclusion may not be original but is an appropriate length.	Introduction is a restatement of the task or is original but no identifiable thesis is included or is too short and/or poorly written. Conclusion is included but is too brief and/or poorly written.	Introduction and/or conclusion is not included or both are wholly unacceptable. May indicate a serious lack of effort on the part of the student.
Did you demonstrate careful reading of at least four of the included documents?	Four documents have been carefully read and considered. Evidence used from all four documents effectively supports the writer's claims.	May meet the criteria for a "4" with three of the four documents but one document may not be as effectively used. Or evidence from four documents is used but may only partially apply to writer's claim or are used unevenly.	Four documents are used but writer could have chosen more fitting evidence. Or only three of the four required documents is used.	Documents are used too briefly to add meaning to the essay or most evidence is irrelevant. May have used all of the documents ignoring instructions to choose either the French Revolution OR the American Revolution.
Did you provide context/historical background to demonstrate connections b/t Enlightenment ideas and Revolution?	Successfully incorporates a discussion of the historical background to demonstrate connections b/t Enlightenment ideas and revolution. Includes details about objections to government abuses, social inequality, etc.	Provides some context when discussing both revolutions or thoroughly discusses background for one revolution but only some for the other.	Little historical background is given for the revolutions. May include some details that are irrelevant or inaccurate. An attempt is made but is inadequate.	No historical background information is given or what is provided is wholly inadequate. May indicate a serious lack of effort on the part of the student.
Do you make clear how the ideas of the Enlightenment philosophers are reflected in the thoughts and actions of political revolutionaries?	Connections between philosophers' ideas and thoughts and actions of leaders is made plainly evident using <i>specific</i> information from documents. The ideas of <i>three</i> different philosophers are used.	Relevant connections are made but document specific evidence may not be included for each philosopher and/or political leader. Some connections may be vague. The ideas of <i>three</i> different philosophers are used.	Some or few relevant connections are made b/t philosophers and political leaders. Specific details from the documents are lacking. May have only discussed the ideas of two Enlightenment philosophers.	Few or no relevant connections are made. May indicate a serious lack of effort on the part of the student.
Did you conform to the style guidelines and did you take the time to thoroughly edit your essay?	Paper is four to five pages in length, double-spaced in 12 point font. Language is clear and there are no significant errors in spelling, grammar, or usage. The essay may show a distinctive and elegant writing style.	Paper may be appropriate in length, etc. but there may be occasional mechanical, grammatical, and/or usage errors. The language may be clear but the writing may not be outstanding.	Paper is inadequately developed. Mechanical, grammatical and/or usage errors distract the reader from the content of the essay and/or sentences may be overly complex which detracts from the effectiveness of the evidence/details.	Quality of writing indicates student's writing skills are underdeveloped and extra help is needed or indicates a lack of effort on the part of the student.
Is your paper well-organized?	Essay is exceptionally well-organized. Purpose of each paragraph is clear, w/ strong topic sentences linked to the thesis. The content of each paragraph is consistent and appropriate.	Essay is organized. Purpose of each paragraph is clear, but topic sentences may be weak. Some content may be inconsistent or irrelevant, and there may be minor issues with paragraph sequence. Paragraphs may be an inappropriate length.	The essay organization is in need of improvement. Purpose of some paragraphs is unclear, topic sentences may need revision and content may be inconsistent or irrelevant, and there are issues with paragraph sequence.	The essay is poorly organized. The purpose of most paragraphs is unclear, and topic sentences are weak. Content is inconsistent and irrelevant. May indicate underdeveloped writing skills or a lack of effort.

Rubric Points: ____/24

Comments:

3 John Locke on the Origins of Human Society and Government

One of Western history's most influential statements of people's rights to live in a society that is run by just and rational laws was made by the English philosopher John Locke (lived 1632–1704). In the introduction to his *Two Treatises of Government* (1689), Locke describes his purpose as “to justify to the world the people of England, whose love of their just and natural rights, with their resolution to preserve them, saved the nation when it was on the very brink of slavery and ruin.” A year earlier, England had undergone a revolution. A monarch who believed in absolute rule, King James II, had been overthrown. In his place, the English Parliament installed James’ daughter, Mary, and her husband, the Dutch Prince William of Orange. This Glorious Revolution (1688) affirmed the supremacy of the legislature, or Parliament, over the monarchy. The English Parliament at the time was not truly representative of all English people, because only certain property holders and land-owning aristocrats could be members. Not until the late 1880s were most Englishmen able to vote, and women first received the right to vote in 1918.

John Locke was one of a new breed of writer-philosopher. He was deeply influenced by the work of scientists like Isaac Newton, who stated the fundamental laws of gravity, and by others who made discoveries in biology and chemistry. He was also influenced by philosophers like René Descartes of France, whose major concern was how people acquired knowledge. Locke’s *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* stands in the tradition of independent thought and inquiry that gave his era the name the Age of Enlightenment.

Locke’s political writings had great influence on the thinkers of the 18th century. The Baron Montesquieu in France, in *The Spirit of the Laws* (1748), extended Locke’s argument that power in government rests with the citizens of a

state and on their choice of leaders (what Locke calls the “legislative”). Montesquieu described the functions of the three separate branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial—that are needed for good government. This division of powers would be the basic organization of the government of the new United States and other democratic nations that arose in the next century.

Excerpts from Locke’s *Second Treatise of Government*, in which he describes the reasons why people form societies, why only the people may choose their rulers and decide how they are to be governed, are given below.

Men being, as has been said, by nature all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another without his own consent. The only way whereby any one divests himself of his natural liberty and puts on the bonds of civil society is by agreeing with other men to join and unite into a community for their comfortable, safe, and peaceable living one amongst another, in a secure enjoyment of their properties and a greater security against any that are not of it. This any number of men may do, because it injures not the freedom of the rest; they are left as they were in the liberty of the state of nature. When any number of men have so consented to make one community or government, they are thereby presently incorporated and make one body politic wherein the majority have the right to act and conclude [bind] the rest.

For when any number of men have, by the consent of every individual, made a community, they have thereby made that community one body, with a power to act as one body, which is only by the will and determination of the majority. . . .

And thus every man, by consenting with others to make one body politic under one government, puts himself under an obligation to every one of that society to submit to the determination of the majority and to be concluded [bound] by it; or else this original compact . . . would otherwise signify nothing, and be no compact. . . .

The great and chief end, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths and putting themselves under government is the preservation of their property. . . .

But though men when they enter into society give up the equality, liberty, and executive power they had in the state of nature into the hands of the society, to be so far disposed of the legislative as the good of the society shall require, yet it being only with an intention in every one the better to preserve himself, his liberty and property . . . the power of the society, or legislative constituted by them, can never be supposed to extend farther than the common good, but is obliged to secure every one's property by providing against those . . . defects that made the state of nature so unsafe and uneasy.

Locke described three defects of the state of nature: (1) lack of established, settled, known law, by common consent to be the standard of right and wrong; (2) lack of a known and indifferent (impartial) judge with authority to determine (settle) all differences according to the established law; (3) lack of power to back and support the sentence (of judges) when right, and to give it due execution (carry it out).

And all this is to be directed to no other end but the peace, safety, and public good of the people.

By commonwealth, I must be understood all along to mean, not a democracy or any form of government, but any independent community which the Latins [ancient Romans] signified by the word *civitas*, to which the word which best answers in our language is "commonwealth," and most properly expresses such a society of men, which "community" or "city" in English does not, . . .

. . . [T]he first and fundamental positive law of all commonwealths is the establishing of the legislative power; as the first and fundamental natural law which is to govern even the legislative [power] itself is the preservation of the society and, as far as will consist [be consistent] with the public good, of every person in it. This legislative [power] is not only the supreme power of the commonwealth, but sacred and unalterable in the hands where the

community have once placed it; not can any edict of anybody else, in what form soever conceived or by what power soever backed, have the force and obligation of a law which has not its sanction from that legislative which the public has chosen and appointed; for without this the law could not have that which is absolutely necessary to its being a law: the consent of the society over whom nobody can have a power to make laws, but by their own consent and by authority received from them.

The end of government is the good of mankind.

#2 (Montesquieu, 1748).

Charles de Montesquieu:

The Spirit of the Laws 1748, Excerpts

HistoryWiz Primary Source

Montesquieu, [Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu (1689-1755)], was an influential French enlightenment political thinker. His *Spirit of the Laws* is his best known work. It is in this work that he explains his theory of separation of powers and checks and balances, ideas which powerfully influenced the American constitution.

"In every government there are three sorts of power; the legislative; the executive, in respect to things dependent on the law of nations; and the executive, in regard to things that depend on the civil law.

By virtue of the first, the prince or magistrate enacts temporary or perpetual laws, and amends or abrogates those that have been already enacted. By the second, he makes peace or war, sends or receives embassies; establishes the public security, and provides against invasions. By the third, he punishes criminals, or determines the disputes that arise between individuals. The latter we shall call the judiciary power, and the other simply the executive power of the state.

The political liberty of the subject is a tranquility of mind, arising from the opinion each person has of his safety. In order to have this liberty, it is requisite the government be so constituted as one man need not be afraid of another.

When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical manner.

Again, there is no liberty, if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control, for the judge would then be the legislator. Were it joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with all the violence of an oppressor.

There would be an end of every thing were the same man, or the same body, whether of the nobles or of the people to exercise those three powers that of enacting laws, that of executing the public resolutions, and that of judging the crimes or differences of individuals.

Most kingdoms in Europe enjoy a moderate government, because the prince, who is invested with the two first powers, leaves the third to his subjects. In Turkey, where these three powers are united in the sultan's person the subjects groan under the weight of a most frightful oppression.

In the republics of Italy, where these three powers are united, there is less liberty than in our monarchies. Hence their government is obliged to have recourse to as violent methods for its support, as even that of the Turks witness the state inquisitors, and the lion's mouth into which every informer may at all hours throw his written accusations.

What a situation must the poor subject be in, under those republics! The same body of magistrates are possessed, as executors of the laws, of the whole power they have given themselves in quality of legislators. They may plunder the state by their general determinations; and as they have likewise the judiciary power in their hands, every private citizen may be ruined by their particular decisions.

The whole power is here united in one body; and though there is no external pomp that indicates a despotic sway, yet the people feel the effects of it every moment.

Hence it is that many of the princes of Europe, whose aim has been leveled at arbitrary power, have constantly set out with uniting in their own persons, all the branches of magistracy, and all the great offices of state."

From Montesquieu, *The Spirit of the Laws*, translated by Thomas Nugent, (London: J. Nourse, 1777)

Edited by Jennifer Brainard c. 2000-2003

#3 (Dec. of Independence, 1776)

The Declaration of Independence – The Grievances



In writing the Declaration of Independence, the Founders knew that they needed to carefully enumerate the reasons for their rebellion. They were after all, declaring to a King and his nation that enabled the creation of the Colonies, that they were taking the Colonies away from the British. Had they failed, they likely would have all been mocked for being stupid, derided for being “terrorists” and likely executed as traitors to the crown. The colonies may have been razed, there is no way to know, but one thing is for sure – had they failed, we would likely all still be subjects of the crown and would probably talk with a funny accent.

The list of grievances is rather long. Some of these may seem weird, silly or unimportant with the context of our modern day. In reading them, it is important to understand that the Colonists spent many years playing with government. They had 13 colonies to try different things – they had a fail-quick environment. They were well-read on government theory and especially knew their history.

By the time they wrote the Declaration they knew what they wanted in a government. Therefore: some of these grievances are clear dereliction or abuses by the king as their sovereign, some of them are outright violations of the English Bill of Rights. Each of them, however, provides a distinct example demonstrating that the king does not meet the rules of government that the Colonists have declared for themselves. Not only were they listing out obvious problems, they were also demonstrating that the king’s way of governing was not the way they were willing to accept being governed. The indictments of the king lay out the pattern for proper government by highlighting the failures of the king to govern properly. They include: government by consent, distribution of power (checks and balances), establishment of executive, legislative and judicial powers, and that the people should have military power – not a standing army.

It’s a rather audacious thing if you consider it – these peasant colonists were literally telling a king that they were not going to be subjects anymore; they were going to be free men who would govern themselves – when there was literally NO SUCH THING at the time! Such an amazing feat of rebellion!

The Grievances:

The exact text of the Declaration is in the first bullet. The sub-bullets provide a simple, modern language explanation of what was being said as well as the Proper Role of Government, or failure thereof that each Grievance was highlighting.

- *“He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.”*
 - He continuously vetoed laws that the colonies attempted to put in place that they believed were needed.

- Just Governments are derived from the consent of the governed – there was no consent to be ruled by the King
- ***“He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.”***
 - Certain kinds of laws passed by the Colonial assemblies were required to be submitted to the king for approval (instead of the being approved by the Colonial (British) Governors). Sometimes they would be neglected for years.
 - Just Governments are derived from the consent of the governed – there was no consent to be ruled by the King
- ***“He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.”***
 - As populations grew larger and new, large, communities formed; the king refused to allow them equal representation in government (government must be by the consent of the governed).
 - Just Governments are derived from the consent of the governed – there was no consent to be ruled by the King
 - Equal Representation in creating the laws is the Right of the People
- ***“He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.”***
 - Shenanigans were created by the Colonial Governors that were effectively interfering with the public business and prevented them from access to information necessary to conduct it.
 - The consent of the People was for the assemblies to have proper access to information
- ***“He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.”***
 - If a Colonial Assembly did or issued something the king did not like (such as charges against him), he ordered the body dissolved and refused to acquiesce to charges or demands.
 - Proper Checks and Balances in Government are necessary
- ***“He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.”***
 - After dissolving their governments, he refused to allow new ones to be elected
 - The Right of Representation arises from Equal Liberty with all other humans, no one has the Right to rule another without that other's consent
- ***“He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.”***
 - The king refused Assent to Laws regarding immigration. He hindered immigration from England and refused to cooperate in furthering the growth of the Colonies.
 - The unalienable Right to Liberty includes the Liberty to make use of Property to provide for oneself and ones family.

- Government should make unused land available to the people by homestead or auction
- ***“He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.”***
 - The king would not allow courts of justice to be established; he constantly interfered and would not allow the Colonies to judge their own criminals or redress upon one another.
 - Just Government derives from the consent of the governed and that government exists to secure rights
 - Without a judiciary to punish criminals and to seek redress from an injury, Life, Liberty and Property are insecure
- ***“He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.”***
 - Judges served, and were paid, at the discretion of the king – making impartiality impossible.
 - Just Government must have a Separation of Powers with Checks and Balances
- ***“He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.”***
 - The king created several new government officials including: customs officials, new offices to collect tax and tax collectors and courts of admiralty that were not approved by colonial legislatures and were therefore illegitimate.
 - Just Government must have a Separation of Powers – the Legislature must approve Executive Appointments or they are illegitimate
- ***“He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.”***
 - Throughout England and America, standing armies had long been regarded a danger which required close supervision. Without the consent of the Colonists, the king sent armies to keep order in the colonies, even though there was no war.
 - Government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; the Legislature, being the Representatives of the People must decide issues like this
- ***“He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the civil power.”***
 - Soldiers were not subject to civil laws. The military could make up and try their own laws.
 - To ensure the security of Rights and Liberties, all citizens must be subject to the Judiciary
- ***“He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their acts of pretended legislation.”***
 - The colonies tentatively accepted the king as their Chief Executive, but they did not recognize parliament or any authority of parliament to legislate over the colonies. In violation of this, the king had assented to multiple laws created by parliament, which affected the Colonists – which they deemed illegal.
 - A Just Government has a Separation of Powers and Checks and Balances
 - All of the Intolerable Acts where a violation of Governance by the consent of the People
 - These came to be called “The Intolerable Acts”: The Boston Port Act (closed the port), The Administration of Justice Act (disallowed the Colonists of trying any British Officials or soldiers) The Massachusetts Government Act (The MA council would be appointed by the king instead of elected), The Quartering Act (forced colonists to house and feed British soldiers) and The Quebec Act (expanded Quebec deeply south into IL, MI, MN, removed Quebec’s representative government and taxed Catholics with the revenue going to the church):
 - ***“Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us”***

- Forced Colonists to house and pay for British troops
- ***“For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit”***
 - Immunized soldiers from Colonial Law
- ***“For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world”***
 - Closing the Boston Port
- ***“For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent”***
 - Taxing in many Acts and methods that were implemented without representation of the colonists
- ***“For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury”***
 - In many cases there were no trials at all; the king decided they were guilty and punished them
- ***“For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences”***
 - People accused of crimes could be taken far way to be “tried” even when the case was very weak.
- ***“For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies”***
 - The Quebec Act extended Canada’s territory into land claimed by the Colonists
- ***“For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments”***
- ***“For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.”***
 - The king abolished laws, suspended legislatures and declared himself to legislate for them
- ***“He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us”***
 - Feb, 1776, parliament declared the colonies out of the king’s protection (a duty of the sovereign) because of the “intolerable degree of unruliness”.
 - The purpose of Government is to protect Life, Liberty and Happiness
- ***“He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people”***
 - The king had essentially declared war on the colonists by burning towns. The British considered the colonists in open rebellion against their lawful rulers. However, the Colonist’s saw their lawful rulers were the the legislatures, that the king had shut down.
 - The purpose of Government is to protect Life, Liberty and Happiness
- ***“He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.”***
 - The king had hired foreign troops to come in and fight against the colonists
 - The purpose of Government is to protect Life, Liberty and Happiness

6 Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen

The National Assembly of the new French Republic wanted to make radical changes in French government. The revolution-ary leaders meant the following document to be the basis of a government that worked for the general good and treated all people in the same fair manner. Like the leaders of the earlier American Revolution, French leaders had adopted the ideas of such political writers as John Locke (1632-1704). They were especially influenced by Locke's *Two Treatises of Government*. (See Document 3 in this unit.) Locke discusses what he called the natural rights of man, or humankind. These are the rights to life, liberty, and property. It is the government's role to act as protector of those rights, and the people's right to replace a government that does not guarantee or safeguard their rights. Locke's ideas formed the cornerstone of the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen.

Preamble

The representatives of the French people, formed into a National Assembly, considering ignorance, forgetfulness, or contempt of the rights of man to be the only causes of public misfortunes and the corruption of Governments, have resolved to set forth, in a solemn Declaration, the natural, unalienable [incapable of being taken away], and sacred rights of man, to the end that this Declaration, constantly present to all members of the body politic [a group of people politically organized under one government], may remind them unceasingly of their rights and their duties; to the end that the acts of the legislative power and those of the executive power, since they may be continually compared with the aim of every political institution, may thereby be the more respected; to the end that the demands of citizens, founded henceforth on simple and [certain] principles, may always be directed toward the [support] of the Constitution and the happiness of all.

In consequence whereof, the National Assembly recognizes and declares, in the presence and under the [power] of the Supreme Being, the following Rights of Man and of the Citizen.

Article 1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be based only on considerations of the common good.

Article 2. The aim of every political association is the preservation of the natural . . . rights of man. These rights are Liberty, Property, Safety, and Resistance to Oppression.

Article 3. The source of all sovereignty lies essentially in the Nation. No corporate body, no individual may exercise any authority that does not expressly [arise] from it.

Article 4. Liberty consists in being able to do anything that does not harm others: thus, the exercise of the natural rights of every man has no bounds other than those that ensure to the other members of society the enjoyment of these same rights. These bounds may be determined only by Law.

Article 5. The Law has the right to forbid only those actions that are injurious to society. Nothing that is not forbidden by Law may be hindered, and no one may be compelled to do what the Law does not [establish].

Article 6. The Law is the expression of the general will. All citizens have the right to take part, personally or through their representatives, in its making. It must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in its eyes, shall be equally eligible to all high offices, public positions, and employments, according to their ability, and without other distinction than that of their virtues and talents.

Article 7. No man may be accused, arrested, or detained except in the cases determined by the Law, and following the procedure that it has prescribed. Those who solicit, expedite, carry out, or cause to be carried out [dictatorial] orders must be punished; but any citizen summoned or [arrested] by virtue of the Law, must give instant obedience; resistance makes him guilty.

Article 8. The Law must [order] only the punishments that are strictly and evidently necessary; and no one may be punished except

by virtue of a Law drawn up and [made public] before the offense is committed, and legally applied.

Article 9. As every man is presumed innocent until he has been declared guilty, if it should be considered necessary to arrest him, any undue harshness that is not required to secure his person must be severely curbed by Law.

Article 10. No one may be disturbed on account of his opinions, even religious ones, as long as the [display] of such opinions does not interfere with the established Law and Order.

Article 11. The free communication of ideas and of opinions is one of the most precious rights of man. Any citizen may therefore speak, write, and publish freely, except what is [equivalent] to the abuse of this liberty in the cases determined by Law. . . .

Article 16. Any society in which no provision is made for guaranteeing rights or for the separation of powers, has no Constitution.

Article 17. Since the right to Property is inviolable and sacred, no one may be deprived thereof, unless public necessity, legally [identified] obviously requires it, and just and prior [compensation] has been paid.

Background +
Context

Bolivar's Address at
Angostura, 1819

#5 (Bolivar's Address, 1819)
WESTERN CIVILIZATION MOVES TO THE NEW WORLD

DOCUMENT 50

Gentlemen:

Fortunate is the citizen, who, under the emblem of his command, has convoked this assembly of the national sovereignty so that it may exercise its absolute will! I, therefore, place myself among those most favored by Divine Providence, for I have had the honor of uniting the representatives of the people of Venezuela in this august Congress, the source of legitimate authority, the custodian of the sovereign will, and the arbiter of the Nation's destiny. . . .

Allow me, Gentlemen, to expound, with the frankness of a true republican, my respectful opinion on a *Plan of a Constitution*, which I take the liberty of submitting to you as testimony of the candor and sincerity of my sentiments. As this plan concerns the welfare of all, I venture to assume that I have the right to be heard by the representatives of the people. I well know that your wisdom needs no counsel, and I know also that my plan may perhaps appear to be mistaken and impracticable. But I implore you, Gentlemen, receive this work with benevolence, for it is more a tribute of my sincere deference to the Congress than an act of presumption. Moreover, as your function is to create a body politic, or, it might be said, to create an entire society while surrounded by every obstacle that a most peculiar and difficult situation can present, perhaps the voice of one citizen may reveal the presence of a hidden or unknown danger.

Let us review the past to discover the base upon which the Republic of Venezuela is founded.

America, in separating from the Spanish monarchy, found herself in a situation similar to that of the Roman Empire when its enormous framework fell to pieces in the midst of the ancient world. . . .

In absolute systems, the central power is unlimited. The will of the despot is the supreme law, arbitrarily enforced by subordinates who take part in the organized oppression in proportion to the authority that they wield. They are charged with civil, political, military, and religious functions; but, in the final analysis, the satraps of Persia are Persian, the pashas of the Grand Turk are Turks, and the sultans of Tartary are Tartars. China does not seek her mandarins in the homeland of Genghis Khan, her conqueror.

Latin America, the vast area colonized and ruled by Spain, did not remain immune from the influences of the Enlightenment and the American Revolution, nor later from the French Revolution and the Napoleonic disruptions. The Latin colonies possessed an elite not only at home with European culture but also familiar with the ideas then sweeping through the Western world.

Latin America, however, was not as well prepared as was North America for revolution and its consequences. The tyranny of Spain, in addition to being harsher than England's, had deprived the Latins of the traditions and experiences of self-government that had readied the English colonies for independence. The Latin lands, furthermore, were ethnically, economically and geographically far more divided than the United States. Their social structure was rigid. The Church was powerful and pro-Spanish. Their masses were woefully ignorant. They lacked the means and the organization to fight a sustained war. Nonetheless, Latin America did rise up. When Bonaparte toppled the Spanish monarchy, the wars of independence began. They lasted from 1809 to 1824. They ended three hundred years of Spanish colonial rule.

The dominant figure of the Latin American wars of independence was Simon Bolivar, scion of a wealthy Caracas family. From his tutors he imbibed the liberal doctrines of the Enlightenment, particularly the egalitarian ideals of Jean-Jacques Rousseau. He traveled widely in Europe. When summoned to leadership, he proved brave and brilliant, adept both at the arts of war and in the political arena. Bolivar, called the Liberator even in his own day, was a sincere idealist but no one understood better than he the burden of Latin America's Spanish heritage. Though a man of the Enlightenment, he could not share the optimism of, say, a Jefferson about the future of his people. Bolivar recognized that when the Spanish were driven out, Latin America's quest for freedom would just begin.

Venezuela declared its independence of Spain in 1811 and established a federal constitution on the model of the United States. But the fight against the Spanish still had to be won. Bolivar was given almost unlimited military and political powers and, against a stubborn foe, waged a bitter war. In 1819, after a series of victories in Venezuela's Orinoco Basin, he convoked a congress at Angostura (later Ciudad Bolivar) to refashion the Venezuelan constitution for use by a group of newly liberated colonies that planned to unite into a nation to be called Great Colombia. In turning over his powers to the congress, Bolivar related his fears, as well as his hopes, for the political development of the new nation, of which he was soon named President. His penetrating observations reveal his deep involvement in the main currents of Western civilization and his apprehension that Latin America would be unable to navigate in them. His is a compassionate commentary on a people only half-introduced to Western ideas and to whom, as a consequence, the full benefits of Western civilization would long be denied.

Excerpts of Bolivar's remarkable speech, delivered on February 15, 1819, are presented here.

America, on the contrary, received everything from Spain, who, in effect, deprived her of the experience that she would have gained from the exercise of an active tyranny by not allowing her to take part in her own domestic affairs and administration. This exclusion made it impossible for us to acquaint ourselves with the management of public affairs; nor did we enjoy that personal consideration, of such great value in major revolutions, that the brilliance of power inspires in the eyes of the multitude. In brief, Gentlemen, we were deliberately kept in ignorance and cut off from the world in all matters relating to the science of government.

Subject to the threefold yoke of ignorance, tyranny, and vice, the American people have been unable to acquire knowledge, power, or [civic] virtue. The lessons we received and the models we studied, as pupils of such pernicious teachers, were most destructive. We have been ruled more by deceit than by force, and we have been degraded more by vice than by superstition. Slavery is the daughter of Darkness: an ignorant people is a blind instrument of its own destruction. Ambition and intrigue abuse the credulity and experience of men lacking all political, economic, and civic knowledge; they adopt pure illusion as reality; they take license for liberty, treachery for patriotism, and vengeance for justice. This situation is similar to that of the robust blind man who, beguiled by his strength, strides forward with all the assurance of one who can see, but, upon hitting every variety of obstacle, finds himself unable to retrace his steps.

If a people, perverted by their training, succeed in achieving their liberty, they will soon lose it, for it would be of no avail to endeavor to explain to them that happiness consists in the practice of virtue; that the rule of law is more powerful than the rule of tyrants, because, as the laws are more inflexible, everyone should submit to their beneficent austerity; that proper morals, and not force, are the bases of law; and that to practice justice is to practice liberty. Therefore, Legislators, your work is so much the more arduous, inasmuch as you have to reeducate men who have been corrupted by erroneous illusions and false incentives. Liberty, says Rousseau, is a succulent morsel, but one difficult to digest. Our weak fellow-citizens will have to strengthen their spirit greatly before they can digest the wholesome nutriment of freedom. Their limbs benumbed by chains, their sight dimmed by the darkness of dungeons, and their strength sapped by the pestilence of servitude, are they capable of marching toward the august temple of Liberty without faltering? Can they come near enough to bask in its brilliant rays and to breathe freely the pure air which reigns therein?

Legislators, meditate well before you choose. Forget not that you are to lay the political foundation for a newly born nation which can rise to the heights of greatness that Nature has marked out for it if you but proportion this foundation in keeping with the high plane that it aspires to attain. Unless your choice is based upon the peculiar tutelary experience of the Venezuelan people—a factor that should guide you in determining the nature and form of government you are about to adopt for the well-being of the people—and, I repeat, unless you happen upon the right type of government, the result of our reforms will again be slavery. . . .

Despite these bitter reflections, I experience a surge of joy when I witness the great advances that our Republic has made since it began its noble career. Loving what is most useful, animated by what is most just, and aspiring to what is most perfect, Venezuela, on breaking away from Spain has recovered her independence, her freedom, her equality, and her national sovereignty. By establishing a democratic republic, she has proscribed monarchy, distinctions, nobility, prerogatives, and privileges. She has declared for the rights of man and freedom of action, thought, speech, and press. These eminently liberal acts, because of the sincerity that has inspired them, will never cease to be admired. The first Congress of Venezuela has indelibly stamped upon the annals of our laws the majesty of the people, and, in placing its seal upon the social document best calculated to develop the well-being of the nation, that Congress has fittingly given expression to this thought. . . .