

Where have we come from? Where are we? Where are we going?  
The World in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century

As Come In: Quotes about history and questions. Music by Mali griot Bassi Kouyate (professes to be in the line of Sundiata's griot) or Jomed's *Montuno Noreno* (Middle Eastern + Cuban) and Eastenders and Sheha's *On the Ride* (cradle of civ + Germany)

I. 5 min. slide show with music and art, from Venus of Willendorf – Carl Orff *Carmina Burana*

II. The World in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century

- A. Ottoman Empire – 5 min. slide show
- B. Safavids – 5 min. slide show
- C. Mughals – 5 min. minute slide show
- D. Ming – 5 min. slide show + video clip from opening of *Turandot*
- E. Edo – 5 min. slide show
- F. Western Europe
  - Literature – Milton (Satan speech) 5 min. what does it mean when Satan is given powerful voice?
  - Art – de la Tour, Rembrandt, Vermeer, and Music – Monteverdi, Handel, Bach (5 min. – Bach *Unaccompanied Cello Suites* – dark and light (chiaroscuro)
  - Ballet – Louis XIV video clip from *Le Roi Danse* (5 min.)
  - Philosophy and Science – portraits and images from work of Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Copernicus, Brahe, Kepler, Bacon, Galileo, Newton (5 min.) – technology explanation
  - Exploration / Trade / Colonization (5 min.)
- G. America – 5 min. slide show of Lost Colony, Jamestown, Plymouth, Florida, California - Video clip from *The Crucible* (5 min.)
- H. Slavery – 5 min. slide show of art, video clip from *The Mission* or Big Bill Broonzy *Treat Me Right*

III. 5 min. slide show from 1700 – today. End with atom bomb, World Trade Towers, Ansel Adams mountain (music underneath: Scarpia's evil soliloquy over the *Te Deum*, in Gothic cathedral, end of *Tosca*, end Act I)

As Exit: Beatles' *Yesterday* in Spring, Elvis's *Santa Claus* in Winter

**Where Have We Come From? Where Are We? Where Are We Going?  
The 17<sup>th</sup> Century**

"The past only exists insofar as it is present in the records of today. And what those records are is determined by what questions we ask. There is no other history than that"

"We are participators in bringing into being not only the near and here but the far away and long ago. We are in this sense, participators in bringing about something of the universe in the distant past and if we have one explanation for what's happening in the distant past why should we need more?" - Physicist, John Wheeler (died last Sunday).

That was.... One of the themes of our course has been language, its importance in oral, written, political and poetic form. Intellectual and aesthetic discourse has dominated our glance at the first 1700 years of the Common Era. So I want to begin with some questions about language. Why isn't our global language today Chinese? Why aren't we speaking Hindi, or Turkish, or Farsi, or classical Arabic, or Urdu? Why ARE we and many of the people of the world speaking English (even when it's not their native language)?

We began Humanities 214 with the dissolution of a united Mediterranean world under Rome. We end it with what we call Western culture rapidly gaining hegemony over the world. How on earth could this have happened? What makes a civilization or empire strong, and what makes it fall apart? What were the magic ingredients in a little tiny island stuck on the edge of the known world, called England? We saw the refinement, technological advancement and supremacy of various cultures. What happened to them? How did Western values come to dominate: political values centered around Democracy; Economic values centered around free market trade; cultural values centered around individualism. I will argue that various combinations of complacency, arrogance, political corruption, decadence, a weakened military and economic bad judgment exhausts and destabilizes empires from within, making it easier for smaller countries to gain ascendancy – countries with the progressive virtues of pragmatic ruthlessness, competition, an ongoing curiosity about new technology, a strong currency and the sort of desperate need that drives risk. I will also argue that Western Europe's unique and most central value, individualism, was one of its principal driving engines – for good and/or ill. What makes an empire thrive and prevail, and what makes it fail?

By the mid 16<sup>th</sup> century, at least five Eastern empires were way bigger, better and badder than little old England, or even little old Europe, and three of them were Muslim (none was Christian): the Ottoman, Mughal, Safavid, Ming, and Edo. By a mere 100 years later they were much weakened or had removed themselves from the world stage.

Edo is the name for ancient Tokyo. In 1590, a brilliant military leader named Tokugawa began to defeat all his enemies and became shogun over a united Japan. He moved the government to Edo and left the emperor a powerless figurehead in Kyoto. Tokugawa immediately beefed up the country's infrastructure and built himself a massively fortified castle, and required that all land-owning nobility spend a certain number of months each year at court in Edo, and that their families reside permanently in Edo. The nobility was happily wrapped in new gorgeous silk brocade kimonos, happily held hostage in elaborate compounds decorated with new woodblock prints and surrounded by elegantly landscaped gardens, and happily entertained with the new Kabuki drama. And the men were very happily and lavishly entertained by beautiful courtesans on Edo's new "floating worlds of pleasure." Why leave? Of course the growing majority living in squalid poverty couldn't leave. Edo became one of the largest cities in the world. However, the Tokugawa shogunate was afraid of two things – the spread of Western influence and Christianity, and the money and power the nobility might gain through international trade. So in 1633 they shut Japan off from the rest of the world – complete isolation for 200 years. With a couple of tightly controlled exceptions, no foreigners were allowed in and no Japanese out, under penalty of death. The Edo dynasty did not NEED the rest of the world. There was no Competition. No curiosity. And what does Tokyo look like today? A Western city.

In 1368 a peasant became emperor of China, founding the Ming Dynasty. In the previous 100 years the Yuan Mongols had taken a rich nation and completely impoverished it. Their once strong military became lax administrators. Their policy of locking native Chinese out of government was resented and led to uprisings. Their combination of excessive spending and trade restrictions led to economic disaster. And their attempts to censor cultural products incensed the literati. So the new emperor inherited a mess. He immediately moved the capital to Beijing, created laws that improved peasant life, lowered land taxes, maintained full granaries against possible famine, and developed a strong military and gave them class status. During the Ming Dynasty, the novel began to be written in everyday language, indicating an increase in popular literacy. Blue and white porcelain was perfected and experimentation in multicolor glazes began. Encyclopedias in many fields appeared, indicating curiosity about the physical world. Dictionaries appeared. The Great Wall was completely rebuilt and armed, with watch towers and cannons. China's navy grew to be the strongest in the world. Their ships were humongous and could hold up to 500 men. This is a century before Columbus' tiny ships bobbed their way to Hispaniola. In 1405 Emperor Zheng sent out a series of seven expeditions that reached Africa. But in 1433 he suddenly shut down the navy, destroyed the ships, and burned all records of the expeditions. From then on, China pursued an isolationist policy. China simply did not NEED anything the rest of the world had to offer. So what went wrong with this successful empire? From the beginning, Ming emperors believed that trade was a lowly occupation, and that agriculture was the proper source of the nation's wealth. Stimulating contact with the larger world was thus discouraged. Inflation of paper currency and depletion of value of copper coin led to more economic troubles. Internal power struggles among the administrators and the nobility led to weakened leadership. Each group was more interested in elevating their guy to emperor than in the governing capabilities of that guy. In 1644 the Manchurian Mongols succeeded in overthrowing the Ming. The new Qing Dynasty lasted until the revolution of 1911 and continued the Ming policy of isolationism. So, we aren't speaking Chinese. (film clip from Turandot) And what does Singapore look like today? A Western city.

Nor is Turkish our global language. The Ottoman Empire was the longest-lasting and largest in history. At its peak it included Turkey, Egypt, Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, Macedonia, Hungary, Palestine, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, most of Arabia, and Northern Africa. In Europe the empire reached to Vienna. According to Ottoman myth, the State was born in a nomadic warlord's dream around 1300, while Dante was writing *The Divine Comedy* and Giotto was painting. Osman I was a real tribal leader in today's Turkey. By 1326 the new state entered history when Bursa was conquered and became its capital. By 1362, when Petrarch was agonizing over Laura and Cicero, and Boccaccio was agonizing over the plague, Murat I reduced Byzantium to the small city-state of Constantinople by conquering everything around it. And as you know, even the impermeable fortress of Constantinople was finally conquered in 1453 by Mehmet II. Mehmet employed a very cool tactic – he dragged his ships overland to get around the chain the Byzantines had strung across the Golden Horn to protect their weak northern flank. Mehmet rode into Constantinople on a white horse, insured the end of Byzantium by slaughtering the population of the city, insured the economic strength of the empire by encouraging merchants and Jewish traders to migrate and settle there, and scared the daylights out of Christendom. We saw how the fall of Constantinople led scholars to flee to Italy. That event also upped the ante on finding western trade routes to access Eastern goods. In 1520, while King Henry VIII was rearranging politics, religion and people's heads in England, Suleyman the Magnificent and his incredible architect, Sinan, began rearranging the Muslim world, architecturally and geographically. Sinan created the iconic image of Muslim architecture – the dome with minarets. What made and kept this empire strong? In addition to promoting trade and encouraging artisans, the empire was highly centralized – everything came back to Istanbul. There was continuity – the empire was ruled by a single family for seven centuries (actually, they initiated a policy of fratricide to ensure smooth transitions of power). The Ottomans were pragmatic. They absorbed good ideas from conquered territories. Their promotion system was, by and large, a meritocracy. The Ottomans encouraged education through a state-run system. They promoted religious tolerance and received loyalty in return. They had a powerful military, consisting of the elite Janissaries (enslaved Christians who converted to Islam and became fanatical fighters), and in the beginning they developed military technology. They had a state-run judicial system. They controlled the landed nobility and their private money and power. And they were united by Islamic ideology – The Sultan was not only the political leader, he was the protector of Islam (think Henry VIII). The Ottoman's Golden Age of peace and prosperity came under Suleyman, called The Law Giver, who slid into power easily because his father had executed all of his own brothers and their sons and all of Suleyman's brothers. The sultan lived in Topkapi Palace surrounded by unimaginable opulence and objects that legitimized Ottoman rule – like Muhammad's cloak and preserved footprint. Suleyman's private residence in the 230-room harem included over a thousand concubines from all over the world. Downside - he had to move every night to avoid assassination. Istanbul during Suleyman's reign was a vibrant, surprisingly secular hub that attracted intellectuals, writers, artists, merchants, and travelers. But the great Ottoman Empire ultimately failed. What went wrong? First, the Ottomans didn't develop and

invest in the territory they conquered – they exploited land and people and then moved on. Second, they grew complacent. The Janisaries became administrators and the military was much weakened. Third, they came to rely on old technology, which resulted in critical losses, such as the naval disaster we saw at Le Panto. Also, they became less centralized, less rigorous in controlling the wealthy, less sensitive to public opinion (more arrogant), more decadent, and had a string of weak sultans – ironically, after fratricide was humanely abandoned. The empire dwindled and Turkey became known as the sick man of Europe. And what does Istanbul look like today?

The other Turkish-speaking empire was the Safavid. The Safavids began in the 14<sup>th</sup> century as a Sufi order with Sunni leanings, but its history was quickly rewritten when its leader converted to Shi'ism. It also began as a religious brotherhood which became political and militant in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, when it waged jihad against its neighbors. In 1501 the Safavids declared independence from the Ottomans and quickly conquered Iran, Georgia and part of Turkey. From the beginning, the Safavid Empire was essentially a theocracy, with Shi'a Islam as the state religion and all other religions and forms of Islam suppressed by persuasion or force. A new religious elite was formed as a tool of the government. It was a tight ship. So tight, the hajj itself was supplanted by the creation of Shi'a holy sites in Iran. The Empire, especially under Shah Abbas, was located on the trade routes between Europe and the East. It became astonishingly wealthy and maintained economic strength. Partly for aesthetic reasons, and partly as an authentication project, Art and its patronage thrived. Painting, metalwork, carpets, and above all the glittering jewel of the capital city, Isfahan, with its lush parks, libraries, and 163 mosques! This elegant city was called "half the world." So what went wrong? In the 17<sup>th</sup> century the shahs became increasingly arrogant, complacent, decadent (alcoholism was rampant), and corrupt. This state of affairs made it possible for the powerful religious elite to depose the shahs and proclaim an Islamic Republic ruled only by a Mujtahid – a scholar of Shari'ah who understood and supposedly followed, in his personal life, Islamic law. Ultimately, when Afghanistan overthrew the ruling group, a division in responsibilities was created between spiritual and political authority. This division still haunts Iran today, and what does its capital city look like now?

Indians use "Mughal" to refer to people descended from Turks and Mongols. Mughal myth claims that the founding conqueror, Babur, was descended from Genghis Khan (Mongolian) and Timur-the-Lame (Turkic). This remarkable Muslim conqueror's first act as ruler was to forbid killing cows, since they were sacred to Hindus – a sign of the religious toleration the new empire would be based on. By the time the conquering phase was over, Babur's grandson, Akbar, reigned over today's India, Pakistan and Afghanistan. The Muslim Akbar is widely claimed as one of the greatest, most civilized, rulers of history. His 150 million subjects were mostly Hindu. How do you maintain control as a ruling minority? Akbar did it by following his grandfather's vision of religious toleration, especially for Hindus. He even married a Hindu princess (of course he is said to have married several thousand wives, so what are the odds?). Akbar invited scholars from all faiths to come to Delhi. He encouraged art, architecture, literature and music, which all flourished. He organized his empire and managed to maintain centralized control, while at the same time giving provincial governors personal responsibility for their territory. He lowered taxes on the peasantry, and decreased them even further in times of famine. He promoted education that included his diverse population's own cultures. He included Hindus in his government at the highest level. He embraced Persian culture. He encouraged trade. And he promoted human rights. The Mughal empire became a melting pot of cultures and even had its own language, Urdu, a blend of Persian, Arabic and Hindi. Akbar not only lifted the tax imposed on non-Muslims, he declared that non-Muslims did not have to obey sharia, and could maintain their own laws and institutions. The symbolic and literal center of Mughal might and wealth was the huge Red Fort in Delhi, inscribed with the lines, "If there is a Paradise on earth, it is here, it is here." So what went wrong? Taxes had to be raised to pay for monumental building projects such as the Taj Mahal. An extremist emperor came to power who ended the policy of religious tolerance, reinstated the tax against non-Muslims, destroyed Hindu shrines and temples, imposed Sharia law on everyone, and captivated and enslaved Hindus. The empire was divided when a Southern Shi'a state split off. And in 1696, with the help of disaffected Hindus, the Mughal city of Calcutta came under control of The East India Company. And what does Mumbai look like today?

Meanwhile, back at the 17<sup>th</sup> century race track, while the various mighty hares of the East rested on their laurels, in small, contentious, impoverished, religiously torn, witch-burning, dirty, dangerous Western Europe, the lowly tortoise kept plodding.

Individualism – the value and authority of the once-lowly human being – was a gift of the Renaissance and the Reformation (think Pico and Luther). In 17<sup>th</sup> century England, individualism moved into the realm of politics – how best to govern. England endured a bloody Civil War, the Puritan Revolution, which involved the unthinkable in an absolute monarchy – regicide. The country literally lost its spiritual and political "head" when King Charles I was decapitated. From that point, the nation moved in violent fits and starts, towards a much tempered, much qualified restoration of Charles II to the throne. In 1688, as a result of a bloodless "Glorious Revolution," England created the world's first constitutional monarchy, in which the individual had a voice. The century's titanic poet and man of letters, John Milton, was involved in the Puritan revolution and became Latin Secretary for its military, political and spiritual leader, Oliver Cromwell. Milton's epic Christian poem, *Paradise Lost*, is about individual Free Will. Individuals can recognize that free will is a gift of a creator god, and can use it rightly to choose to live humbly, joyously and gratefully, in loving harmony with nature and with each other in Paradise. Or individuals can exalt their will above that of the creator god, even claiming self-creation, and pride-fully exercise their will to subvert, to pervert, and to destroy. Milton's great Baroque creation, Satan, is a cautionary tale for humankind about the perils of competitive individualism carried to its logical extreme, complete ego-centricism. What does it mean to give full, eloquent, heroic voice to Satan? How far has that character come from a minor trickster figure in Old Testament Job? Let's move into Satan's 17<sup>th</sup> century head and listen. (live speech)

Chiaroscuro is the best word for 17<sup>th</sup> century visual art. Light and dark. Humans emerge from obscure shadows. A woman is momentarily caught in a beam of light from an open casement window, rendering some apparently insignificant act, pregnant with meaning. Light bounces off the ordinary: apples, goblets, fish, flowers. Individuals are portrayed not as classical ideals, but as mutable flesh and feeling, going about their daily lives – art honors the reality of the physical world and calls it worth looking at.

And in music, that most complex of forms, opera, is invented in Italy by Monteverdi (1609), Handel (1685-1759) creates resounding oratorios for England, and in Germany, Bach (1685-1750) revolutionizes forever the way we hear. Incidentally, the subject of Monteverdi's opera – a popular subject in the 17<sup>th</sup> century – was Orpheus, the human who, through his art, changed the will of the gods and the course of nature. He charmed the gods of the underworld with his music and got permission to bring his dead beloved, Eurydice, back up to life. His project ultimately failed not because of his super-human capabilities, but because of his Human Nature. (slide show of musical instruments and art [de la Tour, Rembrandt, Vermeer] over Bach's chiaroscuro composition – the unaccompanied cello suites)

Of course, not only is politics art, as Machiavelli showed us. Art is politics. Nowhere is this more evident than in ballet. Ballet began as lavish entertainments in Renaissance Italy. At a Milanese wedding banquet in 1489 dances were performed in between courses and were related to the menu. Jason and the Golden Fleece came before the Roast Lamb. Leonardo da Vinci was responsible for the visual elements. The fledgling art form moved to the courts of France in the 16<sup>th</sup> century when Catherine de Medici married the French King. Court ballet became a huge sensation in the reign of Louis XIV, whose title, The Sun King, derived from the role he danced in the Ballet de la Nuit. The constitutional crises that resulted in England in a **constitutional** monarchy produced a very different outcome in France – an **absolute** monarchy. Among his other strategies for maintaining power and authority unchallenged, Louis used ballet. He kept his potentially troublesome nobility at Versailles, lavishly fed and entertained, and made them participate in his ballets. That way they wouldn't be out in their castles stirring up trouble. Watch the highest nobility of France got up as planets and virtues, circle Louis/Apollo/God got up as The Sun. Neither Spectacle nor Political Message is subtle here. The dance is designed to communicate power and control. Technically, ballet came of age under Louis, and its vocabulary, choreographed by his ballet master Lully, grew to incorporate much of what we still use today. (film clip: Le Roi Danse)

Speaking of hubris, let's glance at 17<sup>th</sup> century European philosophy and science. The complete conceptual revolution that European scientists and philosophers accomplished by the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century created a new world view and firmly placed Western values of competitive individualism in the forefront of any race for world domination. I mentioned that one of my arguments for Western Europe's successful rise toward global hegemony was: honest and obsessive curiosity about the human and natural worlds, fueled by a belief in the power of the individual to do almost anything, and to do it before some other individual. We have read Montaigne's denunciation of human arrogance, stupidity, and dogmatism. He stated that we most firmly believe what we know least about, and said that man cannot make a flea and yet tries to make gods by the dozen. Well, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century humanity set one foot on the path toward making a flea. You will encounter the following men and ideas in greater depth in Humanities 324, but they need to be mentioned here, in the context of European hegemony.

In philosophy, the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries saw a revolution in how people thought about themselves and their world in three important areas: what is the nature of existence, why do things happen, and how do I know what is true? Who am I? Why am I? How do I act? Is human nature essentially noble and worthy (in the tradition of Pico) or base and unworthy (in the tradition of Machiavelli)? How we define and perceive ourselves affects how we behave and the nature of the social contracts we create – government.

Renee Descartes (born 1596) is known as the founder of both modern philosophy and analytical geometry - a telling shift from the medieval linkage of philosophy and theology. His most famous philosophical statement was "I think therefore I am." And his most important mathematical discovery was the Cartesian Coordinate System, which linked algebra and geometry. Descartes did believe in the existence of God, however he "proved" God's existence with his own **observation** of the created world and his own **instinct** about its essence. Further, Descartes insisted on the complete Free Will of God's creations.

Thomas Hobbes (born 1588), following Machiavelli's path, asserted that human life in a "state of nature" is "solitary, brutish, nasty and short," where individuals each have completely self-centered license which leads inevitably to a "war of all against all." Based on this view of human nature, he argued, in favor of a strong central authority in the social contract called government. Individuals must give up natural rights in exchange for protection. In his view, a sovereign authority should control all aspects of society: civil, military, judicial and ecclesiastical.

John Locke (born 1632), following Pico's path, believed that humans are reasonable and tolerant. Although people can be self-centered when they get involved in societies and paper currency, in their "natural" condition all people are equal and independent, and do not have the "right" to harm another's "life, health, liberty, or possessions." Locke also advocated separation of powers in the social contract called government, and he further stated that revolution against bad government is not only a right but a responsibility. For Locke, the individual is self-aware, self-reflective consciousness in a body. Locke argues that we come into this world a blank slate, a "tabula rasa," which we fill through our senses and our minds – our experience and our education. In the area of economics, Locke favored a supply and demand theory and promoted free trade.

Science exploded in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. Nicolaus Copernicus (born 1473) re-proposed a heliocentric model of the universe and attempted to explain the motions of the planets with mathematics. His work was the starting point for future astronomical developments and for the linkage of math, physics and cosmology.

Francis Bacon (born 1561) firmly separated religion and science. He rejected reliance on old textual authorities, substituting reliance on observation + experimentation. Knowledge exists separate from the mysterious Divine. The universe has its own, discoverable, laws. Humans can understand, then control, Nature.

Tycho Brahe (born 1546) was sponsored by the king of Denmark, who built for him the world's first astronomical observatory and filled it with accurate instruments. His triangulation of the 1577 comet demonstrated that it was farther away than the moon – bye-bye Aristotle's crystalline spheres. Through constant, diligent voracious observation, he collected massive amounts of data, but was a theoretician so didn't understand the meaning of his accumulated facts. Brahe was a great character. He was obese, elegant, fond of the ladies and beer, had a metal nose from a duel, and died by bursting – ask me later. He was distrustful of his assistant, Kepler, but gave Kepler all his data on his death bed, saying, "Let my work not be in vain."

Johannes Kepler (born 1571) was a mean-spirited, small, skinny, nasty little self-absorbed grump and mystic, whose mother was a witch. He **was** a theoretician, and a **mathematician**. He proved Copernicus with Brahe's observations and his own math. On his death bed he is supposed to have said, "I have studied the lights, now I go to study the shadows."

*Galileo (d.1642) Telescope. Prove Copernicus with eyes - empirical evidence. Published proof earth moves in Dialogue - 1632 - Vernacular. (1600 Bruno executed by Inquisition). Threatened w/torture. Admitted errors ("Eppur si muove"). House arrest. Milton visited. Laws of falling bodies. Earth's gravity. Microscope.*

*Newton (b.1642 same day as G. Died) Kepler's sky-focused laws + Galileo's earth-focused laws = Universal laws. Principia published 1687. All nature's laws describable by mathematics. New language of Physics. Calculus.*

A personal note: I think of science the way I think of art and religion – as a way of asking questions and positing answers – a process of observation about phenomena, then the application of curiosity, question-formulation, imagination, and skill to tell stories about those phenomena. There are byproducts in each of the areas (religion, art and science) that have to do with human **choices** about how to **apply** discoveries in **socio-political** realms. In science, the principle byproduct is technology. I posit this distinction because, while I do feel that there are questions to be asked about the limits of science, I hear people confusing science and technology, and feel that science takes the rap for people's choices about what to do with its insights. The Early Modern Western world had a fascination with technology, akin I think to Japanese post-WWII fascination. How many of us rely on Japanese technology for transportation, entertainment, communication? Francis Bacon famously asserted that the three most important inventions in human history were gunpowder, the printing press and the magnetic compass. Clearly the "discovery" of these technological wonders affected Europe's rise to global domination. And he hadn't met the internet, atomic bomb or space travel!

We have seen how guns changed warfare forever and practically brought an end to Ottoman domination of the Mediterranean at the Battle of *Le Panto*.

We have seen something of how printing revolutionized the human ability to communicate information and, importantly, ideas. It helped spread the Protestant Reformation, increase literacy, and convey news and etched images around a rapidly widening world. The first preserved newspapers appeared in Germany in 1609, England in 1621 and Boston on Thursday September 25<sup>th</sup>, 1690, under the Banner: *Publick Occurrences both Forreign and Domestick*. (The printing press had been imported to Boston in 1638.) In 1694, One century after Queen Elizabeth was shutting down theatrical productions that might be perceived as critical of monarchy, nascent freedom of the press, accompanied by freedom to criticize authority in print, became a recognized English right, helped in no small measure by literary agitators like John Milton.

Where to start with the impact of the compass on European exploration, global expansion and trade? Clearly, Europeans made different choices about what to DO with their technology than did the Chinese – who had these technologies first. We have seen the impact of the European Age of Exploration on native peoples and the ultimate rejection of European values by China and Japan. I would like to concentrate briefly on the impact on **Europeans** of contact with other cultures. First, the massive, in-your-face awareness that Europeans aren't alone seemed to have fed a redefinition of the European self against others – a justification of the rightness of the European world view, with rhetoric, redefinitions of what it is to be human, and that old stand-by, might. Second, the discovery, not that the world is round, but that the world is HUGE, must have cast little England, even little Europe, in a new light. I think of an English pre-Napoleonic complex as emerging at this point – the big little-guy. Third, the influx of American gold into Europe provided economic wealth, stability, and the opportunity for an emerging middle class to become the backbone of society. Suddenly Europe had something to trade besides fish and lumber. Luxury goods from the East made life in Europe, for that middle class, more comfortable, beautiful and tasty.

I'd like to go now to the outpost of the American Colonies in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, since they move onto the world stage at the end of this course, when the French/English war moves to America, and since America will come to dominate the globe. You will study colonization in depth in Humanities 324, but today I want at least to situate the process in the context of European hegemony. From 1584, when Sir Walter Raleigh received his first charter to 1700, the edges of America were overrun. The Netherlands were in the Hudson River Valley – including what is today New York City. France was in South Carolina and Canada as far south as Fort Niagra (<http://maf.mcq.org/jeux/aaciel/index.html> Heavens, My Ship!). Spain was in Florida and on the West coast, having moved up from Mexico in a series of Catholic Missions. And England was everywhere else. New trading companies sprang up. The early English colonies, like Jamestown and Plymouth, flourished with some early help from Native Americans. New World grains such as corn kept the colonists from starving while, in Virginia, tobacco provided a valuable cash crop. By the end of our course, a dozen thriving colonies were functioning as a valuable part of the British Empire, and their products were being enjoyed in Europe: tobacco, fish, furs, sugar cane and its by-product, Demon Rum.

So how does all this economic and political domination occur? I have dwelt for most of this lecture on the bright side of European development, and I do not wish to throw that beautiful baby out with the bathwater as I move to this next section. Of course there was, as there always is, a dark side. And, of course, events were driven by the usual combination of accident and human choice. **Nature** made her contribution to European expansion by creating need. A terrible famine gripped Europe in the early part of the century. New food sources needed to be located, secured and exploited. **War** helped. Persecution and misery always seem to be byproducts of **war**, and Europe's violent 17<sup>th</sup> century was no exception. England's Civil War, the Thirty Years War on the Continent, conflicts with France, Spain and the Dutch – all created desperation among the ostracized and exiled, and a need for new revenues in the coffers of Europe's treasuries. New homes, new beginnings, new promise, new economic resources seemed to glow on the western horizon, despite potential danger and hardship. I would like to suggest, that religious freedom was not the only motivating force of the religious. Often, migration was based on a zealously idealistic determination to build a perfect moral society, with the ironic result that religious communities in the New World were often just as exclusionary, intolerant, eloquently justified with brilliant rhetoric, and physically abusive of any free-thinker, as the communities they came from. For example, among the 17<sup>th</sup> century European exports to the New World was the persecution of witches. In Salem Massachusetts in 1692, a girl fell ill with fits and convulsions and spouted gibberish. When other girls exhibited the same symptoms, the doctor diagnosed – Witchcraft. Before the Puritan Inquisition into the matter was finished, 25 people were executed. (show clip from *The Crucible*) That was only 300 years ago.

To paraphrase John Milton, as he introduced the Fall from Paradise, “I now must change / Those Notes to Tragic; foul distrust, and breach / Disloyal on the part of Man. . .” (PL IX.5-7) **Slavery**. The ascendancy, in the global race for power, of Western Europe was built, arguably, on the backs of helpless, victimized humans whose individual identity (name, tribe, familial status) was deliberately removed. And the ensuing Industrial Revolution, first in England then in America, was built, arguably, on child and immigrant labor. Slavery itself, in its various forms (kinship, chattel, military, sexual in a harem or elsewhere), was not new. Check out the Sumerians, Babylonians and Egyptians – think Moses. But The Trans-Atlantic Slave Trade – especially in an age that prided itself on individualism and reason – slavery as a calculated, critical component of industry and wealth accumulation, was completely new. The Portuguese, cruising down the coast of Africa in the 1400s, were looking for gold, but other countries had sewn up that resource. The Portuguese found, instead, gold in the form of human beings. And the rest of Europe was not far behind. Nor were Muslim and African rulers who could round up the new “resource.” When the Amerindians died off, the colonizers lacked a work force. Thus was the slave trade born, and the horrors of the middle passage. Look at the best numbers we have: 1450-1600 367,000 human beings transported from Africa to the New World. From 1601-1700 (today's century) 1,858,000 souls. From 1701-1800 - 6,133,000 men women and children. And finally, from 1801-1900 – a mere 3,330,000. (show clip from *The Mission*)

Clearly, Western European values, in the areas of politics, science, economy, justice, and above all competitive individualism, have, for good and/or ill, and for the moment, come to dominate the globe. It seems to me that two areas where Western domination has not taken root are religion and art. The world is still marvelously diverse in its philosophies and aesthetics. And it also seems to me that we have much to learn from each other in these areas, if we can listen to each other.

Let me conclude as I began, with a question. What will the global language be in the year 3000? Is it okay with us if it's not American English? Where are the Ottoman, Mughal, Saffavid, Ming, Edo, Mayan, Aztec, Incan, Iroquois, and Mali empires today? It has been argued that the English people, who conquered the world beginning at the end of our period, largely as a result of industry and maritime supremacy (making good stuff cheap at home and spreading it around the world safely), lost supremacy when they stopped concentrating on making stuff at home, and strove to become the world's ruler, banker, and to some extent purveyor of what they saw as “right” philosophy. Sound familiar? Yet with collective humility, thoughtfulness and discipline in the years following WWII, England recouped, not the whole world, but itself.

So lean back and enjoy a preview of coming attractions in art, music, history.... This is a contemporary operatic Satan's soliloquy, in which he gleefully contemplates the seduction of the opera's Eve and the destruction of the opera's Adam, with a Christian gothic choir singing the *Te Deum* in the background – *Tosca*, premiered at the turn into what some historians have deemed the most destructive century in history, the last one)

Western, Christian, Competitive Individualism in the Enlightenment:

“Lord, grant that my work increase knowledge and help other men.

“Failing that, Lord, grant that it will not lead to man’s destruction.

“Failing that, Lord, grant that my article in *Brain* be published before the destruction takes place.”

- Inventor protagonist in Walker Percy’s *Love in the Ruins*.

Good luck with your exams and make wonderful, fun lives. (Beatles’ *Yesterday* on the way out, or Elvis *Santa*)

<http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/ht/09/euwb/ht09euwb.htm> !!!!!!!