University of Sussex

The University of Sussex Undergraduate History Journal

Issue 2: Autumn 2011

"Personality and History"

Edited by Elizabeth Hardwell and Julia Kompe

Contents

Welcome...

...to the Autumn 2011 edition of the University of Sussex Undergraduate History Journal. It's been a busy term and as you can see we've made a few changes to our website which we hope will make things easier to navigate.

We were delighted at the popularity of the first issue, which received a warm reception from students and staff at the University of Sussex and interest from academics at home and abroad. Submissions to the journal have been plentiful and we are consistently impressed with the excellent standard of work that our undergraduates produce.

The theme of our second issue is Personality and History. There are so many ways of approaching historical analysis and the study of popular culture, examining ordinary people and the everyday, has become increasingly important in recent decades. Yet the influence of individual, extraordinary characters remains compelling and should not be neglected. All four pieces in this issue critically examine the influence of personality in a particular time and place.

First to do so is **Katharine Williams**, who presents Catherine of Braganza, Queen Consort to King Charles II. Using highly original primary research, Williams critically analyses her influence upon the English Court during the late 17th century. By looking at Braganza's personal tastes in high art, leisure and fashion and how these were received by her contemporaries, Williams discerns that Braganza left a legacy of Italian and Dutch influences within English court culture.

Jack Merron examines the tyrannical turn of the French Revolution through the works of two men - Montesquieu and Rousseau - and how these mutated to influence the ideals of liberty, virtue, and state terror of one - Maximilien Robespierre. Merron carefully scrutinizes key works in to argue that Enlightenment principles articulated by Montesquieu and Rousseau were adopted by Robespierre and ultimately used to justify civilian purges in order to create a modern France.

Alexander Crawford also explores the French Revolution, by pulling forward the work of Abbé *Sieyès*. In a sustained critique of his political philosophy Crawford highlights Sieyès' dialectical understanding of the nation and the state to get to the heart of the concept of national sovereignty as understood by French revolutionaries.

Finally, **Dominic Butler** considers the influence of the personality and policies of Winston Churchill and his Conservative government in the run up to the 1945 Labour Party victory. Butler locates the Conservative defeat in the issues surrounding Churchill's representation in popular culture and his flailing popularity, and his party's inability to adapt to a desire for change, especially from women who were eager to transform their home and family lives.

We hope you enjoy this latest issue, and we welcome your comments and feedback at usuhj@sussex.ac.uk. Look out for our next edition coming soon.

Best wishes,

Elizabeth Hardwell and Julia Kompe
The USUHJ Editors

What was the Cultural Significance of Catherine of Braganza to the English Court of the 17th Century?

Katharine Williams

History with French B.A., University of Sussex (Brighton, UK)

Abstract: This article aims to explore the cultural impact that Catherine of Braganza, Queen Consort to King Charles II, had upon the English Court during the late seventeenth century. This article will argue that Catherine had a significant and lasting influence in the cultural domains of music, art, courtly fashions, furniture and leisure and entertainment pursuits during the period, some of which extended beyond the court. Cultural opposition at court presented by mistresses to King Charles II will also be considered whilst examination of contemporary perceptions of these cultural developments will help to determine the cultural significance of this previously largely underrated Queen.

Keywords: Catherine of Braganza; Charles II; Queen Consort; Giovanni Battista Draghi; Henry Purcell; Antonio Verrio; Jacob Huysmans; Benedetto Gennari; Court Culture; Furniture; Entertainment; Leisure; Design; Italy

When the Portuguese princess Catherine of Braganza, became Queen Consort to King Charles II and arrived at court in 1662, she found that 'her upbringing had not prepared her for the exceptional licentiousness of the Restoration court'[1] which had just emerged from 'years of denial' under the puritanical regime of Oliver Cromwell[2]. She also found that this young court 'was torn between solid old-fashioned English virtues and newly acquired, high-fashion French customs'[3] represented by a series of pro-French mistresses to Charles. Edward Corp writes that although 'the Queen could not compete with the royal mistresses in the King's bed, she was at least a match for them as regards to cultural patronage'[4]. Consequently, Clarissa Campbell Orr writes how Catherine began to patronise Italian culture in opposition to these French cultural influences, in order to 'establish her own cultural identity'[5] which helped to improve her position and status at court. However, Andrew Barclay describes how 'monarchs and their consorts were not the only active patrons' to court culture as 'they were surrounded by peers and financiers, many with more disposable income than the crown, who could collect art, pioneer new styles of building or patronise

[1] Corp, Edward in Campbell Orr, Clarissa, *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837, Royal patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.53.
[2] Thomas, Gertrude, *Richer than spice, how a royal bride's dowry introduced cane, lacquer, cottons, tea and porcelain to England* (New York: Knopf, 1965), p.29.
[3] Ibid. p.58.
[4] Corp, op.cit., p.64.
[5] Campbell Orr, op.cit., p.18.

poets'[6]. Nevertheless, Campbell Orr asserts that royal women such as Catherine 'were at the centre of 'celebrity culture' of this period, able to influence taste, fashion, social customs and moral values'[7], and she recognises the significant contribution made by foreign born queens such as Catherine to 'the cosmopolitanism of the British court'[8]. As a result, it appears that the cultural significance of Catherine of Braganza to the English court of the late seventeenth century should be examined and considered.

One area of court culture where Catherine was able to exert a strong influence was that of music. Agnes Strickland writes that 'Queen Catherine delighted in music'[9] but following her arrival in England her Portuguese musicians 'did not please the King or any of his court and disgusted them with apparently 'discordant' concerts'[10]. Certainly, courtier Sir John Evelyn wrote in 1662 that her Portuguese ensemble consisted of 'pipes, harps, and very ill voices'[11]. Around the same time the diarist Samuel Pepys who also had a lot of access to court, recounted that 'I heard their Musique too...which may be good, but it did not appear so to me, neither as to their manner of singing, nor was it good concord to my eares'[12]. However, Catherine 'did not approve of the English and French musicians provided for her'[13] and so as an alternative she 'increasingly employed Italians'[14] in her chapel. Catherine was notoriously pious, which may help to explain why she preferred the religious plagal cadences of the Italian composers, compared to the more frivolous ornamental tone of the French music already at court. Before long, 'Queen Catherine's chapel...was the best place to hear Italian music in London'[15] and Catherine patronised 'the Italians so thoroughly that she succeeded in identifying herself with the music they offered'[16].

In April 1668 she appointed the eminent Giovanni Sebenico to be the master of the Italian music of her chapel[17]. Then in 1673 he was replaced by Giovanni Battista Draghi who provided Catherine 'with Italian music of a quality to rival anything that the French faction could offer'[18]. These musical developments were noted enthusiastically by Pepys who wrote that in the chapel 'two boys did sing some Italian songs, which I must in a word say I think was fully the best musique that I ever yet heard in all my life, and it was to me a very great pleasure to hear them[19] and in 1667 he heard 'the Italian musique at the Queen's chapel, whose composition is fine'[20] and which 'did appear most admirable to me, beyond anything of ours - I was never so well satisfied in my life with it'.[21] Martin Adams also describes how

[6] Ibid., p.29.
[7] Ibid., p.7.
[8] Ibid., p.8.
[9] Strickland Agnes, *Lives of the Queens of England* (London: Harrison and Sons Ltd, 1857), Vol. V, p.593.
[10] Calendar of State Papers, Venetian xxxiii in Peter Leech, 'Musicians in the Catholic chapel of Catherine of Braganza - 1662-92', *Early Music*, 29, (London: 2001), p.575.
[11] Evelyn, John, '*The Diary of John Evelyn'*, ed. E.S. de Beer, (Oxford: 1995), p.322 in Leech, op.cit., p.573.
[12] Pepys, Samuel, '21st September 1662', *www.pepysdiary.com*, (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).
[13] Leech, op.cit., p.575.
[14] Corp, op.cit., p.59.
[15] Barclay Andrew in Campbell Orr, op.cit., p.84.
[16] Corp, op.cit., p.60.
[17] Ibid., p.59.
[18] Ibid., p.60.
[19] Pepys Diary, '21st December 1663', www.pepysdiary.com, (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).
[20] Ibid., '7th April 1667'.
[21] Ibid., '22nd March 1667'.

in the Chapel Royal there was a lot of 'Italianate music by English composers'[22]. Perhaps most significantly Henry Purcell, 'the most noted composer of his age'[23], was employed there[24] where he 'gained much early inspiration from the Italian music encouraged by Catherine'[25]. In fact, Purcell stated in the preface of his *Sonnatas of III Parts* in 1683 that he ''faithfully endeavour'd a just imitation of the fam'd Italian Masters', and that his 'Country men...should begin to loath the levity, and balladry of our neighbours'[26] (i.e. the French). In fact, Adams describes how Purcell soon abandoned Anglo-French textures and that 'he moved towards the methods of Italian composers'[27]and Franklin Zimmerman claims that Purcell's 'Laudate Ceciliam' of 1683 was especially written for the Roman Catholic chapel of Catherine of Braganza[28].

Catherine's patronage of Italian music extended beyond the Chapel Royal to the rest of the court. For instance, as early as 1666, an Italian Opera was performed at the King's House 'introduced by the Italian musicians Catherine had in her service'[29]. It was extremely successful and Pepys writes 'I confess I was mightily pleased with the musique'[30]. Furthermore, Catherine also 'appears to have been the first patroness of the Italian school of singing'[31] and Pepys enjoyed a concert of these vocalists on the Thames in September 1668; ''the Italians came in a barge under the leads...and so the queen and the ladies went out and heard it for almost an hour; and endeed it was very good''[32]. Also Evelyn writes in the early 1680s about 'several music parties at which Bartolomeo performed with a 'Mr. Baptist' (Giovanni Battista Draghi)'[33] thus suggesting that due to Catherine's personal patronage Draghi's popularity had spread beyond the court. However, not all contemporaries preferred the Italian style of music. Evelyn wrote that he considered 'the angelic voice of Mrs. Knight 'to excel those of the Queen's Italian vocalists' and that 'the lute of Dr. Wallgrave rivalled the harpsichord of Signor Francesco'[34]. Strickland writes further that 'it was... long ere an English audience learned to relish the Italian opera, much less to give it the preference over the masques of Ben Jonson and Milton, and the operas of Dryden'[35]. Nevertheless, Corp recognises the significance of the Queen's 'successful' patronage, 'for whereas musical taste in London during the 1660s had been mainly French, by 1670s it had become for the most part Italian'[36]. Thus it can be seen that Catherine's patronage of Italian musicians which had begun in her private chapel, was in general

[22] Adams, Martin, *Henry Purcell the origins and development of his musical style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p.38.
[23] Marshall Alan, *The Age of Faction Court Politics, 1660-1702* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), p.67.
[24] Ibid., p.67.
[25] Campbell Orr, op.cit., p.31.
[26] Purcell, Henry, 'Sonnatas of III Parts', (London: 1683) in Wainwright, Jonathan, *Musical Patronage in Seventeenth Century England* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1997), p.206.
[27] Adams, op.cit., p.43.
[28] Zimmerman Franklin, 'Henry Purcell...', (1983) in Adams, Martin, op.cit., p.38.
[29] Thomas, op.cit., p.151.
[30] Pepys, '12th February 1666', *www.pepysdiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).
[31] Strickland, op.cit., p.593.
[32] Pepys, '28th September 1668', *www.pepysdiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).
[33] Leech, op.cit., p.578.
[34] Evelyn, John in Strickland, Agnes, op.cit., p.623.
[35] Ibid., p.622.
[36] Mabbett, Margaret , *'Italian musicians in the Restoration...'* in Campbell Orr, op.cit., p.60.

received enthusiastically by courtiers and that these musical influences spread considerably throughout the court.

Catherine was also an active art patron with a 'taste in the fine arts'[37] and a 'collection of paintings at Somerset house'[38]. Corp writes how soon Catherine made another 'attempt to create an independent cultural identity'[39] by choosing Dutch painters such as Dirk Stoop and Jacob Huysmans to paint her portrait instead of the court favourite Peter Lely. Julia Alexander writes that apparently Huysmans called 'himself her Majesty's Painter' and that the number and quality of his portraits of the Queen reflect this[40]. Campbell Orr writes how during the period a queen became a figure represented in the visual culture of the age[41] and this was certainly true in the case of Catherine. For example, Huysmans famous 1664 portrait of Catherine as St Catherine of Alexandria, prompted a 'fashion for women to be painted in the same guise as a compliment to the queen'[42]. Even Pepys reports less than a year later that when his wife's portrait was being painted 'Mr. Hales' begun my wife in the posture we saw... like a St. Katharine'[43] thus implying that Catherine's choice of painter had made a significant impact on the court. Soon, Catherine's artistic patronage extended to Italian artists. For example, Evelyn describes; 'a world of figures, painted by Verio'[44] in her chapel, referring to Antonio Verrio who also 'illustrated the God's assembling in the Queen's drawing room'[45]. Catherine also patronised Benedetto Gennari following his arrival in England in 1674. Corp asserts that the Queen used Gennari to strengthen her position as 'the champion of Italian cultural styles'[46]. Certainly, 'the number of altarpieces and other religious paintings ordered by Queen Catherine was enough to provide him with a steady source of income'[47]. Catherine's influence at court is evident when 'prompted by his work for Catherine, Charles II employed Gennari to decorate his new apartment at Windsor'[48] and 'members of Catherine's household and chapel also employed him to produce both sacred works and portraits'[49]. Therefore, judging by how other imitated it, Catherine's patronage of Italian and Dutch artists made a significant impact upon the culture of the court.

It can also be argued that over time Catherine made a significant impact on the style of dress of the court. For example, when Catherine and her ladies first arrived in England, Leech describes how 'their ornate national costumes provoked instant and unconcealed laughter from English courtiers'[50] and Evelyn's first impression of 'the Queene' and her 'Portugueze Ladys' in their 'mo[n]strous fardingals' and 'her majestie in the same habit, her foretop long and turned aside very strangely'[51] appears to confirm this. Miller describes

[37] Strickland, op.cit., p.599.
[38] Corp, op.cit., p.66.
[39] Ibid., p.60.
[40] Alexander, Julia, 'Huysmans , Jacob (c.1630–1696)', *www.oxforddnb.com,* (Date Accessed 27.04.2010).
[41] Campbell Orr, op.cit., p.16.
[42] Wynne, Sonya, 'Catherine (1638–1705)', *www.oxforddnb.com, (*Date Accessed 27.04.2010).
[43] Pepys, '15th February 1665', *www.pepysdiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).
[44] Evelyn, John, 'The Diary of John Evelyn' in ed. Bowle, John (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), p.351.
[45] Marshall, op.cit., p.66.
[46] Corp, op.cit., p.63.
[47] Levey, Michael, 'Later Italian Pictures', (1964) quoted in Campbell Orr, op.cit., p.85.
[48] Corp, op.cit., p.63.
[49] Ibid., p.63.
[50] Leech, op.cit., p.573.
[51] Evelyn, op.cit., '30th May 1662', p.194.

how 'her Portuguese fashions ...seemed rather incongruous in Charles's court'[52] as the fardingdales or rigid hoop skirts of Queen Elizabeth's era had been out of fashion in England for at least half a century'[53]. However, the Earl of Clarendon claimed that Catherine's ladies made her believe that if she would not 'depart from the manners and fashions of her own country...she would quickly induce the English ladies to conform to her majesty's practise''[54]. Consequently, Pepys records in October 1666 that he had heard talk that 'the Queene hath a great mind to alter her fashion, and to have the feet seen, which she loves mightily; and they do believe that it [will] come into it in a little time'[55]. However, Agnes Strickland argues that 'it was in vain that she occasionally exhibited herself in short petticoats' as 'she found few imitators'[56]. Nevertheless, she concedes that parasols which had been 'unknown in England in that era' soon became fashionable due to Catherine as 'the courtly belles used the gigantic green shading fans which had been introduced by the Queen and her Portuguese ladies, to shield their complexions from the sun'[57]. She also writes that 'the India trade opened by Catherine's marriage-treaty soon supplied the ladies of England with fans...to be used as weapons of coquetry at balls and plays'[58]. Furthermore, courtiers still paid close attention to the fashions of Catherine, as Pepys often notes her outfits; ''it was pretty to see the pretty young ladies dressed like men, in velvet coats, caps with ribbons, and laced bands'[59]. Therefore, although not all aspects of Catherine's dress were approved of, some of her habits such as fans and parasols were adopted by the court and thus she made a significant contribution to its style.

Another area of court life where Catherine was able to exert her influence was in her choice of furniture. For example, Liz Granlund asserts that Catherine was interested in objects from the Far East[60]and this was noted by Evelyn in 1662 that 'the Queene brought over with her from Portugal , such Indian Cabinets and large trunks of Laccar, as had never before ben seene here...'[61]. Campbell Orr writes how she had 'a modernised suite of rooms at Whitehall'[62]and Evelyn noted that by the time she left them in 1685 'even the marble walls of the Queens bathrooms were hung with ''india's stuffs''[63]. Even the Portuguese ambassador stationed at the court of St James's owned at least half a dozen lacquer cabinets[64] which demonstrates how 'starting in the apartment of the Queen, these novelties rapidly spread to the rest of the court' [65]. This is also true of the porcelain Catherine brought with her; Gertrude Thomas writes that prior to her arrival neither Hampton Court or Whitehall had enough porcelain to even mention it in records but that 'within one short

[52] Miller, John, *Glorious Revolution* (London: Longman Press Group, 1983), p.48.
[53] Thomas, op.cit., p.27.
[54] Lister, Henry, T., 'Life and administration of Edward, first earl of Clarendon, Volume II' (1838) quoted from original MS., The British Museum, Lansdowne MSS. 1236 in Thomas, op.cit., p.38.
[55] Pepys, '20th October 1666', *www.pepysdiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).
[56] Strickland, op.cit., p.582.
[57] Ibid., p.567.
[58] Ibid., p.567.
[59] Pepys, '27th June 1666', *www.pepysdiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).
[60] Campbell Orr, Clarissa, *Queenship in Europe 1660*-1815, T*he role of the consort* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p.72.
[61] Evelyn, op.cit., 2nd June 1662, p.195.
[62] Campbell Orr, *Queenship in Britain*, op.cit., p.26.
[63] Evelyn in Thomas, op.cit., p.48.
[64] Evelyn, op.cit., '4th December 1679', p.277.
[65] Corp, op.cit., p.65.

generation...the porcelain of Catherine's childhood' had helped turn 'tea into a palatable pleasure for Englishmen'[66] suggesting its new popularity. In addition to this, Thomas describes how 'when not made of 'French walnut tree' chairs were painted black to simulate the expensive ebony Catherine had made the fashion' [67] and she describes how 'Restoration chairs curved high into a so-called ''Portuguese arch'' or crown' and that 'on some, the legs were also bulb-turned' and ended in what became known as ''Braganza-toe''[68]. Thus, it appears that Catherine's taste in furniture had influenced the culture of the court and Evelyn even remarked in 1673 when shown the newly imported cabinets and porcelains of a friend, that ''to this excess of superfluity we were now arrived...not only at Court but almost universally''[69] thus implying that Catherine's tastes had significantly permeated court life and beyond.

Perhaps one of the most significant of Catherine's cultural contributions to the court was, as John Bowle writes, her popularization of tea drinking in England[70]. Laura Martin describes how before Catherine came to court people drank tea 'for medicinal purposes, rather than for its taste'[71]. For example, Pepys records in 1660 'I did send for a cup of tee, (a China drink) of which I never had drank before''[72] thus suggesting that tea was neither well known nor popular before Catherine came to England. However, Martin writes that Catherine was 'credited with introducing tea to the royal court in England' and that 'tea's popularity took a giant leap forward' becoming quickly 'associated with royalty and the upper class'[73]. Strickland affirms that 'Catherine's favourite beverage, tea...became a fashionable refreshment in England[74]. Tea was such a significant addition to the court that in 1663 Edmund Waller, a 'central figure among those poets associated with the court'[75], wrote the complimentary ode 'Of Tea, commended by Her Majesty'. Within this he writes 'Tea, does our fancy aid,/Repress those vapours which the head invade'' declaring that ''The best of Queens and best of herbs we owe/To that proud nation which the way did show'[76] thus acknowledging Catherine's personal responsibility for introducing tea to the court . Additionally, thirty years later in 1692 Guy Miege a Swiss immigrant wrote in his yearly descriptions of England that 'the use of...teas' are 'now so prevalent in England'[77], this implied that Catherine's introduction of drinking tea for pleasure had spread beyond the culture of the court, even to the rest of the country and was thus significant in its longevity.

The entertainments and leisure pursuits of the Court is a final area where Catherine's influence can be discerned. For example, Strickland writes that she was fond of

[66] Thomas, op.cit., p.120.
[67] Ibid., p.67.
[68] Ibid., p.66.
[69] Evelyn, '17th April 1673' in Thomas, op.cit., p.31.
[70] Bowle, John, *The Diary of John Evelyn* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p.435.
[71] Martin Laura, *Tea: the drink that changed the world* (Vermont: Tuttle Publishing, 2007), p.120.
[72] Pepys, '25th September 1660', *www.pepysdiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010*).*
[73] Martin, op.cit., p.120.
[74] Strickland op.cit., p.521.
[75] Chernaik, Warren, 'Waller, Edmund (1606–1687)', *www.oxforddnb.com,* (Date Accessed: 27.04.2010).
[76] Waller Edmund, 'Of tea, commended by her Majesty', (1663) in ed. Thorn-Drury, George, *The poems of Edmund Waller* (UK: Routledge, 1905), p.222.
[77] Guy, Miege, 'New state of England under their majesties King William and Queen Mary', (1691) in Pincus, Steve, *England's Glorious Revolution 1688-89, A brief history with documents* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2006), p.62.

ombre[78] which was 'an intimate card game for three players' from Portugal[79]. She must have introduced this to the court as Pepys reports in 1666 'this evening, going to the Queen's side to see the ladies, I did find the Queene, the Duchesse of York, and another or two, at cards'[80]. Sir Walter Scott also wrote that Catherine had ''an excessive love of dancing''[81]and thus she often arranged balls[82] and organised 'a number of masques'[83] and there was 'dancing every night at her house'[84]. Furthermore, Catherine made Tunbridge Wells fashionable after she began visiting the town in the summer of 1663 hoping that the spa waters there would help her get pregnant[85]. These visits appear to have caught on as Alan Marshall describes how soon the court had 'occasional forays' to the spas at Tunbridge Wells'[86]. Lilias Campbell Davidson describes how Catherine 'took the step... of sending for players from a London theatre to perform plays before the court'[87] and that 'in the evening the bowling-green brought people together, and there was generally dancing on it'[88]. The organisation of these cultural pursuits are clearly traced to Catherine through the Accounts of her Privy Purse where it is recorded she paid £2.00 in August 1663 to 'the Moris dancers in Tonbridge''[89]. Contemporaries also noted the growth in popularity of the town as Pepys writes in 1666 that once again 'the Queene and Maids of Honour are at Tunbridge'[90], whilst fifteen years later Evelyn writes 'my Wife etc was returned from Tunbridge'[91]. This suggests that due to Catherine's patronage of Tunbridge Wells it had become a popular cultural alternative to the court in London. Therefore, Catherine's cultural influence and significance at court extended to the leisure activities and entertainments she endorsed there.

In fact, a good way to determine the cultural significance of Catherine to the court is to examine how much money she spent on culture at court and in which particular areas. Surviving records indicate that apart from money spent on Morris dancers for the court at Tunbridge Wells, Catherine spent a lot on music and entertainments at court in London. For example, Sir Thomas Strickland, Keeper of the Privy Purse to Charles II, had his secretary Thomas Shepherd compile in 1669 a 'List of her Majesty's Servants and their Wages'. Included within this was 'Musitioners being 15, 12 of them apeece £120', 'The ma[ste]r of ye musick for himselfe & musick boyes £440' another 'ma[ste]r of ye musick £100', '6 musitioners apeece £100'[92] and 'a Master of her Majesty's games'[93]. These records thus demonstrate that Catherine spent large amounts of money on music and entertainments. Furthermore, in her will Catherine leaves ''to the architector John Antumez one hundred

[78] Strickland, op.cit., p.667.
[79] Thomas, op.cit., p.64.
[80] Pepys, '17th February 1666', *www.pepydiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010*).*
[81] Sir Walter Scott in his notes to Dryden's works quoted in Strickland, op.cit., p.597.
[82] Wynne, Sonya in ed. Cruickshanks, Eveline, *The Stuart Courts* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2000), p.173.
[83] Wynne, Sonya, *www.oxforddnb.com,* (Date Accessed 27.04.2010).
[84] Strickland, op.cit., p.578.
[85] Wynne, Sonya, *www.oxforddnb.com,* (Date Accessed 27.04.2010).
[86] Marshall, op.cit., p.20.
[87] Campbell, Davidson, Lillias, *Catherine of Braganza, Infanta of Portugal and Queen Consort of England* (London: John Murray Press, 1908), p.221.
[88] Ibid., p.221.
[89] 'Accounts of Queen's Privy Purse', TH / Vol. XXXVI , The National Archive, (Longleat House).
[90] Pepys, '22nd July 1666', *www.pepydiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010*).*
[91] Evelyn, op.cit., '30th August 1681', p.294.
[92] Strickland papers at Sizergh Castle, Cumbria as quoted in Leech, op.cit., p.581.
[93] Tom Shepherd's Orthography quoted in Strickland, op.cit p.603.

milreis''[94] a substantial sum of the Portuguese contemporary currency, thus suggesting that she ascribed much importance to architecture. In the same document, she also refers to 'all the Images as Pictures, Reliefs, Ornaments and other Vestments... which shall not be for the actuall life and service of my Chapell'[95] thus implying that she had spent on and owned a lot of art that was not simply for religious practise. These records of Catherine's cultural expenses and possessions therefore demonstrate how much money she spent on music, art, architecture and entertainments for the court and thus reinforce the argument that she made a significant impact upon the court culture of the period.

Another means of assessing the cultural significance of Catherine to the court is by examining how the contemporary poets and writers of the court perceived her and her cultural innovations. For example, Edmund Waller declared significantly in 1683 'What Revolutions in the World have been, /How are we chang'd since we first saw the Queen!'[96] implying that since the arrival of Catherine, her cultural contributions and innovations at court had been so effective and recognisable as to constitute 'Revolutions'. Nathaniel Thompson also described Catherine in 1685 as a ''Muse, that does the Mind inspire,/ And Tunes the Strings of the Poetick Lyre?'' and that she made 'The Courtier Flatter and the Poet Write'[97] thus suggesting that she inspired both music and poetry at court. He also recognised that 'She, as a Dowry brought to England more,/Than any other Queen that ever came before'[98] acknowledging her contributions to the court. 'Captaine lieutenant to your Highness' Edmund Gayton also anticipated in the early 1660s the exotic 'richest presents' of the dowry of 'Katharine of Briganza' even if he did not perceive how far her 'fragrant Oranges' , 'Brasil Sugar' and 'Indian Gold'[99] were to take hold in the court. Furthermore, the prominent female author, Aphra Behn, also addressed Catherine in 1685, noting that following Charles's death 'Your Court, what Dismal Majesty it wears' and 'No more Recesses of the Sprightly Gay'[100] thus implying that previously Catherine had held a gay and lively court. Moreover, contemporary satire reflects Catherine's cultural impact upon the aristocracy in almost every domain; 'Mrs. Trapes in Leadenhall street is hawling away the Umbrellas for the walking Gentry,Mrs Kanister...buys up all the course Bohee-Tea...and Mrs Furnish...had order'd lots of Fans and China, and India Pictures'[101]. These acknowledgements of Catherine's cultural innovations made by contemporary writers would suggest she had made a significant impact on Court culture and beyond.

However, on the other hand, Nancy Maguire claims that historians have tended to underrate the influence of the royal mistresses on the court[102] even though Catherine

[94] 'Will of Queen Catherine', (1699), The National Archives, *http://193.132.104.74/documentsonline/details-result.asp?Edoc_Id=1837404&queryType=1&resultcount=34,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).

[95] Ibid.

[96] Waller, Edmund, 'Of her Majesty, on New-Year's Day' (1683) in Thorn-Drury, op.cit., p.221.

[97] Thompson, Nathaniel, 'A Heroick poem most humbly dedicated to the Sacred Majesty of Catherine Queen Dowager' (1685), Early English Books Online, *http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.10)

[98] Ibid.

[99] Gayton, Edmund, 'To the most Illustrious Prince his Highnesse James Duke of York & c. A Votive Song for her sacred Majesties happy Arrivall', (1661), British Library, *001380681.*

[100] Behn, Aphra, 'A poem Humbly Dedicated To the Great Patern of Piety and Virtue Catherine Queen Dowager on the Death of her dear Lord and Husband King Charles II', (1685), British Library, *M.46 1347.*

[101] Baker, T., 'A fine Lady's Airs' (1708) as quoted in Thomas, op.cit., p.152.

[102] Cruickshanks, op.cit., p.7.

complained to Charles in 1683 that 'the mistresses governe all'[103]. Maguire describes how these mistresses represented a 'strong pro-French influence at Whitehall'[104]which opposed the Italian influences of Queen Catherine[105]. When determining the cultural significance of Catherine of Braganza the relative importance of their cultural opposition must be taken into account. For instance, although Catherine had taken 'infinite trouble to induce the English ladies to adopt' shorter skirts 'the ladies dressed in French fashions, and would not hear of any other, constantly sending artificers and dressmakers to Paris, to import the newest modes'[106]. Evelyn also describes how he attended a dinner held by the Duke of Norfolk where he heard ''excellent Musique, perform'd by the ablest Masters both French and English'[107] and he noted in 1685 ''the King sitting and toying with his concubines, Portsmouth, Cleveland, Mazarin, &c'' whilst 'a French boy' was 'singing love songs in that glorious Gallery'[108]. This suggests that the French music of the mistresses remained a strong presence throughout the court despite Catherine's patronage of Italian musicians. Furthermore, Pepys describes in 1667 how his wife was attempting to emulate the hair styles of one of the French mistresses, Frances Stewart 'only because she sees it is the fashion'[109] and he himself writes of 'the French periwigg maker of whom I bought two yesterday'[110]. Sonia Wynne further describes how the mistresses put on entertainments for the court[111] such as 'many French dances'[112]. Thus Marshall concludes that not Italian but 'French ideas, fashions and sensibility became the norm amongst the elite who inhabited the court'[113]. Perhaps the most important cultural opponent to Catherine was Louise Kéroualle, 'The Duchess of Portsmouth, a French lady'[114] as described by courtier Sir John Reresby, who Maguire claims 'was the King's favourite mistress[115]. Portsmouth had important an important role in dispensing patronage[116] as demonstrated in Article 11 of Lord Shaftesbury's 'The Articles of High Treason...against the Duchess of Portsmouth' where he claimed that ''hardly any grant, office or place was given, but through her''[117]. Campbell Davidson describes further how 'the court flocked around ''the Lady'' and made her their centre'[118] and courtiers certainly acknowledged in their diaries the powerful cultural position of the Duchess. For example, Evelyn wrote in 1675 that 'I was Casualy shewd the Dutchesse of Porsmouths splendid Appartment at Whitehall, luxuriously furnished, and with

[103] CSP dom pt 1 202, (1683) quoted in Wynne, Sonya, *www.oxforddnb.com,* (Date Accessed 27.04.2010).
[104] Maguire, Nancy in Smuts, Robert, *The Stuart Court and Europe, Essays in Politics and Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p.248.
[105] Corp, op.cit., p.56.
[106] Strickland, op.cit., p.522.
[107] Evelyn, 'The Diary of John Evelyn' (1955) ed. E. S. de Beer as quoted in Leech, op.cit., p.572.
[108] Evelyn, op.cit., '6th February 1685', p.321.
[109] Pepys, '4th February 1666', *www.pepysdiary.com,* (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010*).*
[110] Ibid., '30th March 1667'.
[111] Wynne in Cruickshanks, op.cit., p.172.
[112] Strickland, op.cit., p.582.
[113] Marshall, op.cit., p.65.
[114] Reresby John in 'Memoirs of John Reresby' ed. Browning, Andrew (Glasgow: Jackson Son & Co, 1936), p.293.
[115] Maguire, op.cit., p.247.
[116] Ibid., p.247.
[117] Lord Shaftesbury, 'The Articles of High Treason and other high Crimes and Misdemeanours against the Duchess of Portsmouth' (1680), (Carte MS 72, fos. 520-1 Bodleian) quoted in Maguire, op.cit., p.255.
[118] Campbell, Davidson, op.cit., p.152.

ten times the richnesse and glory beyond the Queenes''[119]. In 1683 he went on to describe the extreme wealth that he saw in Portsmouth's rooms; ''the new fabrique of French Tapissry...Japon Cabinets, Skreenes, Pendule Clocks, huge Vasas of wrought plate, Tables, Stands, Chimny furniture, Sconces, branches, Braseras & c...besides of his Majesties best paintings' [120]. Corp also describes how regarding music Portsmouth put on a French opera 'to counter the Italian influence of the Queen', and when Catherine patronised Dutch and Italian painters 'the Duchess of Portsmouth responded by patronising the French portraitist Henri Gascars' who arrived in 1674[121]. The fact that she felt the need to respond to Catherine's cultural ambitions demonstrates how threatened she felt by Catherine's own cultural influence at court[122]. Nevertheless, Corp describes how gradually 'the King began to turn to other and less important mistresses'[123] who did not produce so strong a threat to Catherine's cultural prestige. Therefore, it appears that although at certain times the King's mistresses represented a considerable threat to Catherine's cultural status, due to the temporary nature of their positions at court their influence on court culture was not as long term or substantial as the Queen's.

Finally, in order to best determine the cultural significance of Catherine of Braganza the legacy and longevity of her cultural innovations must be examined. Whilst French painter, Gascars, and 'the Duchess of Portsmouth's French singers' had withdrawn to the continent by 1677 Catherine's Italians 'Gennari and Draghi remained'[124]. In fact, Draghi continued to serve Catherine until she returned to Portugal in 1692, and in 1687 he was appointed organist of James II's new Catholic chapel at Whitehall' as James and his Queen also had 'pro-Italian musical tastes'[125]. In 1687 Evelyn confirmed 'I was to heare the Musique of the Italians in the new Chapel'[126] suggesting their influence was still strong. James II also continued to commission works from Verrio and Gennari[127] and Robert Smuts affirms further that 'the habit of collecting Italian art...spread well beyond the court'[128].

Catherine's thirty years in England saw a revolution in English taste regarding design, costume and interior furnishings'[129] and significantly almost 100 years later the Earl of Orford asks ''how we did before tea and sugar were known''[130]. Therefore, although Corp claims that Catherine did not succeed in completely ousting her rivals as 'there was always room at the English court for both French and Italian styles'[131], he admits that 'she played a major role in creating the cosmopolitan nature of the English court'[132] and that it would be a

[119] Evelyn, op.cit., '10th September 1675', p.258.
[120] Ibid. '4th October 1683', p. 307.
[121] Corp, op.cit., p.60.
[122] Ibid., p.60.
[123] Ibid., p.6.
[124] Ibid., p.645.
[125] Marshall, op.cit., p.68.
[126] Evelyn, op.cit., '29th December 1687', p.251.
[127] Cruickshanks, op.cit., p.8.
[128] Smuts, Robert, *Court culture and the origins of a royalist tradition in early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), p.289.
[129] Corp, op.cit., p.67.
[130] Cunningham, Peter ed. *The letters of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford,* (1858) quoted in Thomas, op.cit., p.177.
[131] Corp, op.cit., p.64.
[132] Ibid., p.64.

mistake to discount her cultural influences.[133] Martin goes as far to say that outside of the court 'Catherine's influence on England was not only immediate and domestic, but long-lasting and far-reaching as well'[134] and Thomas elaborates that in England, Catherine's 'foreign influence shaped the turn of a chair leg, popularized the use of woven cane, made fashionable a cup of tea, and further dramatically enriched English living in countless unexpected ways'[135]. Campbell Davidson also writes of Catherine's cultural legacy, that following her return to Portugal 'those who had esteemed her and loved her in the country she had left, did not now forget her'[136].

Thus it can be seen that despite opposition, Catherine of Braganza's cultural legacy to the English court of the seventeenth century, through her patronage of Italian and Dutch musicians and artists, her furniture and style tastes, her introduction of drinking tea for pleasure, and her endorsement of entertainments such as at Tunbridge Wells, appears to have been extremely significant. Although perhaps some of her cultural influences were not adequately recognised contemporarily, in the long term they had an impact upon many areas of culture, not only within the royal court but throughout England as a whole. It seems the view of Edmund Waller has considerable weight: 'What Revolutions in the World have been, /How are we chang'd since we first saw the Queen!'[137]

[133] Ibid., p.64.
[134] Martin, op.cit., p.121.
[135] Thomas, op.cit., p.31.
[136] Campbell, Davidson, op.cit., p.481.
[137] Waller, Edmund in Thorn-Drury, op.cit., p.221.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Bowle, John (ed.), *The diary of John Evelyn* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

Browning, Andrew (ed.), *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby* (Glasgow: Jackson Son & Co, 1936).

Pepys, Samuel, Extracts, *www.pepysdiary.com*, (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).

Thorn-Drury, George (ed.), *The poems of Edmund Waller*, Volume 2, (London: Routledge, 1905) '*Of her Majesty, on New-Year's Day'* (1683) and *'Of tea, commended by her Majesty'*(1663).

Early English Books Online
Thompson, Nathaniel, (1685), 'An Heroick poem most humbly dedicated to the Sacred Majesty of Catherine Queen Dowager'*, http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home,* (Date Accessed: 22/04/10).

British Library Manuscripts
Behn, Aphra, *A poem Humbly Dedicated To the Great Patern of Piety and Virtue Catherine Queen Dowager on the Death of her dear Lord and Husband King Charles II* (London: J. Playford, 1685), British Library M.46 1347.

Gayton, Edmund, *To the most illustrious Prince his Highnesse James Duke of York ... a votive song for her Sacred Majesties [Catherine, Queen Consort of Charles II.]* (London, 1661), 001380681.

National Archives Online
Accounts of the Queen's Privy Purse, *Aug.1663 £2.0.0 to the Moris dancers in Tonbridge*, TH/Vol. XXXVI, (Longleat House).

'Will of Queen Catherine of Braganza' (4/14 February 1699), Includes codicil, undated; translation of will (14 March 1706) and translation of codicil (29 March 1706), PROB 1/56, http://193.132.104.74/documentsonline/details-result.asp?Edoc_Id=1837404&queryType=1&resultcount=34, (Date Accessed: 22.04.2010).

Secondary Sources

Adams, Martin, *Henry Purcell, the origins and the development of his musical style* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Campbell, Davidson, Lillias, *Catherine of Braganza, Infanta of Portugal and Queen Consort of England* (London: John Murray Press, 1908).

Campbell Orr, Clarissa, *Queenship in Europe 1660*-1815, *the role of the consort* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Campbell Orr, Clarissa (ed.), *Queenship in Britain 1660-1837, Royal patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic politics* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

Fraser, Antonia *The Weaker Vessel, woman's lot in seventeenth century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson ltd, 1984).

Israel, Jonathan, I., *The Dutch Republic: its rise to greatness and fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

Leech, Peter, 'Musicians in the catholic chapel of Catherine of Braganza 1662-1692' in *Early Music*; 29(4), (2001).

Maguire, Nancy K., 'The Duchess of Portsmouth: English Royal consort and French politician' in Robert M. Smuts, *The Stuart Court and Europe, Essays in politics and political culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Marshall, Alan, *The Age of Faction, Court Politics 1660-1702* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

Martin, Laura C., *Tea: the drink that changed the world* (Vermont: Tuttle Publishing, 2007).

Mendelson, Sara H., and Crawford, Patricia M., (eds.), *Women in Early Modern England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Miege, G., 'Social life in late seventeenth century England' in Pincus Steve *England's glorious revolution 1688-89, a brief history with documents* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2006).

Miller, John, *The Glorious Revolution* (London: Longman Press Group: London, 1983).

Miller, John, *Charles II* (London: Weidenfeld &Nicholson, 1991).

Miller, John, *James II* (London: Methuen London, 1989).

Ramsey L. G. G., *The Stuart Period 1603-1714 (*Pennsylvania: Connoisseur, 1957).

Smuts, Robert, *Court culture and the origins of a Royalist tradition in early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).

Strickland, Agnes, *Lives of the Queens of England, Volume* V (London: Harrison and sons ltd, 1857).

Thomas, Gertrude Z., *Richer than spice, how a royal bride's dowry introduced cane, lacquer, cottons, tea and porcelain to England* (New York: Knopf, 1965).

Wainwright, Jonathan, *Musical patronage in seventeenth-century England: Christopher, first Baron Hatton, 1605-1670* (Aldershot: Scholar Press, 1997).

Weil, Rachel J., *Political passions: Gender, the Family and Political Argument in England, 1680-1714* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

Wynne, Sonya, The mistresses of Charles II and Restoration court politics, 1660-85' in Cruickshanks Eveline *'The Stuart Courts* (Stroud: Sutton, 2000).

Websites

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 'Huysmans , Jacob (c.1630–1696)', *http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14321*, (Date accessed 27.04.2010) .

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 'Waller, Edmund (1606–1687)', *http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28556*, (Date accessed 27.04.2010).

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 'Draghi, Giovanni Battista (c.1640–1708)', *http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8017*, (Date accessed 27.04.2010).

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 'Catherine of Braganza (1638–1705)', *http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4894*, (Date accessed 20 Feb 2010).

From Liberty to Terror: Robespierre and the justification of the Reign of Terror

Jack Merron

BA History, University of Sussex (Brighton, UK)

Abstract: By studying such works as Montesquieu's *The Spirit of the Laws* and Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *The Social Contract* we can trace the mutation of the principles of the Enlightenment into a platform in which the French Revolution took its infamous and bloody turn. This article aims to assess the writings of Montesquieu and Rousseau and their crucial influence on Maximilien Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety. It is a look into how the revolution for liberty and equality transformed into the Reign of Terror, as well as offering a conclusion to the how and why of Robespierre's justification and his influence on the push towards a modern France.

Keywords: Montesquieu; Rousseau; Enlightenment; liberty; terror; Robespierre.

On the 28th July 1794 Maximilien Robespierre, along with key members of the Committee of Public Safety, was guillotined without trial in the Place de la Revolution. What ended that day was a dictatorship whose twelve month drive towards the preservation of liberty and virtue had resulted in the justification of terror and violence against its own people. Robespierre "the Incorruptible" had finally become a victim of his own ideological crusade for perfecting the human condition. However the short-term events of the Reign would give to birth to a new, more far reaching institution of state terror.

Exact figures are debatable, but during the Reign of Terror that descended upon France around 50,000 people were guillotined in the name of liberty and virtue. In doing so Robespierre not only created the concept of modern state terror but can also be seen as an attempt to secure the Republic that had begun in the chaos of the storming of the Bastille. Created in 1793, the Committee of Public Safety was instituted as the guard between France and the collapse of the republican experiment. Robespierre, a provincial lawyer and Jacobin inspired by the Enlightenment, arrived from obscurity to become head of the Committee and the most powerful man in revolutionary France. His goal of securing the Republic soon came to justify terror as a means of protecting "the greater good". Anyone guillotined was done so for they were an enemy of the Republic, of liberty and of virtue. As the months progressed the paranoia of both aliens and internal spies threatening the foundations of the republic fed the terror machine more and more, and the violence escalated. However, whereas the Ancien Regime and monarchy represented all the decadence and despotism of the old Europe, in its own eyes the Committee was the head of the new French Republic and symbolised what it meant for a human to be a true, virtuous citizen.

When addressing the Reign of Terror we must analyse the inspiration, justification but also the reality of the context in which these atrocities took place. The members of the

Committee were inspired by the work of Rousseau who professed the sovereignty of the people and the importance of virtue as a means to stop a nation descending into despotism. However for Robespierre and his followers these works became the benchmark to which they would be able to identify true citizens of the Republic, and execute all those they viewed as enemies. Beyond Enlightenment rhetoric used by Robespierre we must address the realities of France's situation as a means of justifying terror. By 1793 with the King executed and five European armies placed at France's borders the hopes of a new Republic that begun in 1789 were on the brink of collapsing. Like the future uses of state terror which are justified in order to keep a revolution going, Robespierre can be viewed as the first example of someone who in order to protect the future was forced under circumstances to purge a nation of its dangers. As with many other blood-lettings throughout history, those who were innocent would also become victims. When studying the justification of the Reign of Terror we ultimately arrive at whether the character of Robespierre should be viewed as a savage dictator, or as a logical extension and somewhat inevitable by-product of the revolution.

Before we can fully address the justification of the Terror we must first analyse the major works that influenced the revolution. The work that is believed to have inspired Robespierre the most is Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *The Social Contract*. Published in 1762, *The Social Contract* identifies the problems that Rousseau believed the people and the state faced when trying to set up a political community. The key concept in *The Social Contract* is that of the connection between natural law, political law and the liberty of man, which Rousseau deemed as the General Will. The natural law that Rousseau states is that 'Man is born free; and everywhere he is in chains'[1], therefore man is naturally free but has to create the environment, the state, for his liberty to exist. It is the question of man's liberty, the state and the law that is crucial in understanding Rousseau's work and its impact on Robespierre and the terror.

According to Rousseau, for man to 'renounce all liberty from his will is to renounce all morality from his acts'. [2] Liberty therefore was a signature of what it meant to be a true, moral person. For Rousseau this morality that stemmed from liberty allowed the people to make their own laws, but never be above them for all people are equal in their liberty, which results in a state being 'as perfect as it can be, and no associate has anything more to demand'[3]. The loss of liberty however meant the loss of morality, which resulted in a break down to despotism. *The Social Contract* not only gave Robespierre and the Committee the ideological tools with which to secure the French Republic, but also a stark warning of the perils of a society falling into decay. When 'social bonds begin to be relaxed and the State to grow weak, when particular interests begin to make themselves felt and the smaller societies to exercise an influence over the larger…the general will ceases to be the will of all." [4] These 'smaller societies'[5], aliens, spies, counter-revolutionaries, which threatened to undermine the principles of the Republic were deemed by the Committee enemies due to

[1] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right* (1762), p.2. Translated from French by G.D.H. Cole, http://www.ucc.ie/social_policy/Rousseau_contrat-social.pdf (accessed 26.04.2011).
[2] Ibid., p.7.
[3] Ibid., p.11.
[4] Ibid., pp.81-82
[5] Ibid., pp.81-82.

their differences and would be exterminated in order to protect the liberty Rousseau had defined. Rousseau serviced as both inspiration and fuel for the paranoia of the Terror.

Montesquieu's theories on liberty and virtue in *The Spirit of the Laws* are also important in helping our further understanding of the philosophies of the revolution and Terror. In *The Spirit of the Laws* Montesquieu describes the three governments, these being a republic, a monarchy and despotism. A republic is whereby 'the body, or only part of the people, is possessed of the supreme power', a monarchy is in which 'a single person governs by fixed and established laws', and a despotic government is where 'a single person directs everything by his own will and caprice.'[6] Montesquieu further states that 'when the supreme power is lodged in the hands of a part of the people, it is then an aristocracy'.[7] In Enlightenment theory this is how we can class France at this time for despite trying to secure the sovereignty of the people, the Committee held the power.

One of the major theories in *The Spirit of the Laws* is the link between virtue and liberty and their existence within government. In order for a republic to function then 'one spring more is necessary, namely, virtue'[8] for in a popular state no one is above the law as all have liberty, however virtue is needed in order for those entrusted with the law to maintain and uphold it. Similar to the concepts of liberty linked with morality in Rousseau. Furthermore it is the converging of these two principles that creates a true citizen and allows a republic to flourish. For Montesquieu this virtue is necessary in both popular government and aristocracy, as without virtue a republic will collapse. 'When virtue is banished, ambition invades the mind of those who are dispersed to receive it, and avarice possesses the whole community'[9]. The members of the Committee would have known the importance of virtue and liberty when it came to governing a country and that it was key to their own power. However the fear of calamity if virtue was lost became a driving force that lay behind the conducting of the terror.

Montesquieu's writings on corruption and virtue in relation to despotism offer a deeper insight into the contradictory nature of the Terror. According to Montesquieu, 'as virtue is necessary in a republic, and in a monarchy honour, so fear is necessary in a despotic government: with regard to virtue, there is no occasion for it'.[10] Fear is necessary for despotism and virtue for a republic, and virtue does not exist in despotism. However fear defined the Terror, and yet the Terror was a means of protecting virtue. Furthermore within despotism complete subjugation of the people is necessary and 'persons capable of setting a value upon themselves would be likely to create disturbances. Fear must therefore depress their spirits, and extinguish even the least sense of ambition'.[11] In a despotic society those creating ideas separate from the fear are seen as threats to those in power as these persons of deviation can instigate change and revolt. These persons are reminiscent of the 'smaller societies'[12] that Rousseau describes as shaking the foundations and risking the

[6] Baron de Montesquieu, Charles de Secondent, *The Spirit of Laws* (1748), p.25. Translated from French by Thomas Nugent (1752,) http://www.efm.bris.ac.uk/het/montesquieu/spiritoflaws.pdf (accessed 27.04.2011).
[7] Ibid., p.25.
[8] Ibid., p.37.
[9] Ibid., p.38.
[10] Ibid., p.43.
[11] Ibid., p.43.
[12] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right, 1762* translated by G.D.H. Cole

republic. Therefore if we take the notions put forward by Montesquieu and Rousseau then those in both despotism and republics who deviate from the paradigm threaten the structure of that society and as a result are enemies. Through this almost paradoxical thinking we then arrive at the Reign of Terror. Virtue is void in despotism and replaced with fear. Virtue is needed to uphold the laws, which protect the liberty of the people. However during the Terror Robespierre and the Committee used despotic fear in the name of protecting liberty and it is from this that we can see the revolutions bloody, Enlightenment mutation.

When discussing corruption Montesquieu again can be used to assess the nature of the terror. Aristocracies become corrupt 'if the power of the nobles becomes arbitrary: when this is the case, there can no longer be any virtue either in the governors or the governed'[13]. During the Terror the power of the Committee and Robespierre, despite laws being past to legalise the killings became, due to its paranoid nature, arbitrary in the victimisation of the innocent as virtually anyone could be guillotined as an enemy of the state. In the Enlightenment sense the Terror as a quest for a virtuous utopia in fact resulted in a loss of virtue as Robespierre and his followers became corrupted and consumed by their crusade and descended into the despotism they had sworn to eradicate. We have addressed the writings that would come to inspire the Terror, now in order to understand its psychology we must analyse the laws of the Committee and the speeches of Robespierre to see how these Enlightenment principles were used as justification for atrocities.

The first major move towards state terror was the *Law of Suspect*, passed by the Committee on September 17th 1793. The law allowed for the creation of tribunals right across revolutionary France that had the power to execute those that fell into the broad definition of suspects. Such suspects included 'those who, by their conduct, associations, comments, or writings have shown themselves partisans of tyranny or federalism and enemies of liberty', as well as 'those former nobles... who have not constantly demonstrated their devotion to the Revolution'. [14] In the *Law of Suspects* we can see the beginnings of the paranoia and arbitrariness that would come to define the Terror. It also demonstrates the Terror as a piece of legislation and a fusing together of ideology and bureaucracy. If the ideological purity of France was to be achieved then it had to be an administrative process lest the revolutionary government itself lost it legitimacy and virtue. In our analysis of the Terror the *Law of Suspects* is an important benchmark from which Robespierre and the Committee set the tone of the government that was being put into place. Furthermore it is from this point that Robespierre, in his speeches to the Convention, begins to mutate the inspiration of the Enlightenment in order to justify what was to follow.

Eight days later on the 25th September 1793 Robespierre delivered a speech in the Convention that outlined a defence of the Committee of Public Safety and its actions. While not as infused with Enlightenment rhetoric as later speeches it still provides an early

p.81-82 (26.04.2011) http://www.ucc.ie/social_policy/Rousseau_contrat-social.pdf

[13] Ibid., p.133.

[14] Duvergier, Jean-Baptiste, 'The Law of Suspects' in *Collection complète des lois, décrets, ordonnances, règlements, avis du conseil d'état... de 1788 a 1830...* 2nd ed., 110 vols. (Paris, 1834–1906), http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/417/ (accessed 29.04.2011).

indication of how Robespierre saw the role of the Committee at the start of the Terror, while also presenting the almost contradictory nature of the situation. Robespierre to the Convention, 'can it be that the Citizens you have charged with the most difficult functions have lost the title of imperturbable defenders of freedom because they've accepted this burden?'[15] Robespierre was essentially saying that the Committee had been given a job to do by the people and therefore the people should not be critical when the Committee performs its task. Simply put, as Robespierre further stated, 'your glory is tied to the success of those who you have garbed in national confidence'[16] and therefore such acts as the *Law of Suspects* were justifiable, as it was part of what was necessary for the Committee to perform its job. Furthermore for Robespierre at this early point any questioning of the Committee by the people must have only proved to him this necessity and of the necessary acts that were to come as the battle for the French people's virtue had only just begun.

This speech does not reflect the Enlightenment justification of the Terror but gives a clear indication that at the very start Robespierre looked upon Revolutionary France as a great task given to the Committee. Furthermore it was the Committee that held the necessities to move forward and that the French people should allow it to do its job. By early 1794 the Terror had become a well-oiled yet complex machine that was the beating heart of an ideological war for France's virtue. It is in Robespierre's speech on the 5th February 1794 that we can see the inspiration of Rousseau brought forth as he laid down his justification for the Terror. Robespierre defined the ultimate goal of the revolution as being 'the peaceful enjoyment of liberty and equality' and 'all the virtues and all the miracles of the republic in place of all the vices of the monarchy.[17] This early part of the speech reflects the Enlightenment idealism of Robespierre and perhaps of the Terror itself. That if the revolution created a virtuous republic then that was what was most important and therefore the means of getting there were justifiable in the end result. In his speech Robespierre also demonstrated incredible zeal and conviction for the cause of what the Committee was doing. According to Robespierre, in order to 'finish the war of liberty against tyranny and safely cross through the storm of the revolution' the French people had to 'smother the internal and external enemies of the Republic', to 'lead the people by reason and the people's enemies by terror'.[18] This is how Robespierre justified the revolution's transformation into terror. By classing the quest for virtue and liberty as a war then Robespierre and the Committee had a basis on which to identify enemies of their Republican ideology and therefore cause to eliminate those enemies. Terror, as Robespierre saw was 'nothing but prompt, severe, inflexible justice; it is therefore an emanation of virtue'.[19] It was justified in order to achieve those Enlightenment goals of creating a virtuous republic.

However the Enlightenment as means of justification raises another issue about Robespierre. It can be argued that as the works of Enlightenment inspired the revolution

[15] Robespierre, Maximilien, *Discours et rapports a la Convention* (Paris: Union Générale d'Éditions, 1988). Translated from French by Mitch Abidor. http://www.marxists.org/history/france/revolution/robespierre/1793/defense-committee.htm

[16] Ibid.

[17] Robespierre, Maximilien, *On Political Morality* (1794). http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1794robespierre.asp (accessed 4.05.2011).

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

then Robespierre was not an individual case and in fact was an extension and continuation of what had gone before. The fight for virtue and liberty had begun before Robespierre became head of the Committee. Furthermore before the inception of the Terror, violence had already been a defining feature of the revolution. With counter-revolution, threat of civil war, hunger riots, foreign spies, political intrigue, economic instability and imperial armies placed at its border, France was more a 'calamity piled upon a disaster'[20] than a new shining republic. The Committee was not conceived on stable ground as France was in chaos and thus dramatic action needed to be taken. Robespierre himself understood the realities of the situation as the fear and paranoia that came to define the Terror was not fictitious but were part of the world had that had been created by the actions of 1789. Robespierre and his followers therefore can be seen as an extremity born within extremity, and that the Terror that they used was justified as a way to quell France's crippling chaos.

Furthermore the synchronising of terror and virtue was called for before Robespierre was elected to the Committee. As can be analysed 'the first months of 1793 were to prove, that threat was indeed everywhere, and capable of penetrating . . . the remotest corners of the country'. [21] As a result of fears and uncertainties brought forward by the revolutionary atmosphere a sense of a 'fight for survival' took hold over France. It was this that would send 'republican France into the Terror with a population mobilised to an unheard-of extent, and ready to commit remarkable crimes in the name of liberty'. [22] 'Place Terror on the order of the day!'[23] was demanded for before it's use by the Committee. This is the arena that Robespierre entered in the summer of 1793, a Republic in turmoil and a people calling for Terror. With the world that had been created in revolutionary France Robespierre, propelled by his own Enlightenment obsession, inherited a Republic that believed it 'had to be terrible if it was to prevail. [24]

The revolution for the virtue and liberty of the people had been inspired by the works of those such as Rousseau, who professed that it was through these principles that a society could exist without the vices of the Old World. However, in the chaos and calamity of the revolution it came to be believed that in order for virtue and liberty to be achieved then a mass purging of all those who would oppose and threaten it had to occur. Terror therefore became the tool in which this utopia would be achieved. For Robespierre 'Terror and virtue were part of the same exercise in self-improvement'[25] and so the two became synonymous in both inspiration and justification. It can be argued that Robespierre and his ideals could only have existed and developed in a world such as the French Revolution and in this sense the man and the revolution almost fuelled one another. Both allowed for the drive and justification of the other. The moral depravity and ugliness of Robespierre and the Terror is clear, however in a revolution consumed by chaos and fear atrocities were justified as the means to reach the path of security. And while Robespierre's infamy and notoriety live on in his legacy of state terror and violence, so too do the foundations of democratic virtue and liberty that he sought to protect, which puts into question the ultimate goal of Robespierre and his Reign of Terror.

[20] Andress, David *The Terror: Civil War in the French Revolution* (London: Little Brown, 2005), pp.63- 64.
[21] Ibid., p.150.
[22] Ibid., p.179.
[23] Ibid., p.420.
[24] Schama Simon, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (London: Viking, 1989) p.767.
[25] Ibid., p.828.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Duvergier, Jean-Baptiste, 'The Law of Suspects' in *Collection complète des lois, décrets, ordonnances, règlements, avis du conseil d'état... de 1788 a 1830...* 2nd ed., 110 vols. (Paris, 1834–1906), http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/417/ (accessed 29.04.2011).

Baron de Montesquieu, Charles de Secondent, *The Spirit of Laws* (1748). Translated from French by Thomas Nugent (1752) http://www.efm.bris.ac.uk/het/montesquieu/spiritoflaws.pdf (accessed 29.04.2011).

Robespierre, Maximilien, *Discours et rapports a la Convention* (Paris: Union Générale d'Éditions, 1988). Translated from French by Mitch Abidor http://www.marxists.org/history/france/revolution/robespierre/1793/defense-committee.html (accessed 29.04.2011).

Robespierre, Maximilien, *On Political Morality (*1794) http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1794robespierre.asp (accessed 29.04.2011).

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Social Contract or Principles of Political Right* (1762).
Translated from French by G.D.H. Cole http://www.ucc.ie/social_policy/ Rousseau_contrat-social.pdf (29.04.2011).

Secondary Sources

Andress, David, *The Terror: Civil War in the French Revolution* (London: Little Brown, 2005).

Schama, Simon, *Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution* (London: Viking, 1989).

What Did Sieyes Mean By National Sovereignty?

Alexander Crawford

International Relations B.A., University of Sussex (Brighton, UK)

Abstract: The French Revolution and *Quatre-Vingt-Neuf* is considered an epoch creating moment in much of the historiography of the modern state and the international system. The period from 1789, through the Napoleonic era to the subsequent geopolitical settlements of the Congress of Vienna in 1815, is seen as consolidating a domestic 'national interest' and marking a high point of *raison d'État* and realist power politics. The intention of this article is to locate the concept of sovereignty in the philosophical, political-economic and political-scientific writings of Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès, an often neglected yet key theorist of the French Revolutionary period. An engagement with his work can inform considerations of the historical specificity of the nation-state, and the potential role of ideology and reason in the agency/structure debate.

Keywords: Abbé Sieyes; nation-state; sovereignty; the Third Estate; French Revolution; 1789; republic

Art 1. – Sovereignty is one, indivisible, inalienable, and imprescriptible. It belongs to the Nation; no section of the people, nor any individual, can attribute to itself the exercise of sovereignty.
Art 2. – The nation, from which alone all emanate, can only exercise its powers by delegating them. – The French Constitution is representative: the representatives are the legislative branch and the king. – *Les Constitutions de la France depuis 1789*[1]

Often cast as the theoretical architect of the French Revolution of 1789, Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyes was a figure writing during a period of the crystallisation of Enlightenment thought into modern political forms. As such the concepts and tensions around which his work centred, including democracy and individualism, material and social survival, and equality and accountability, are still those that underpin Western liberal thought. Moreover they are those that inform his conception of 'national sovereignty.'

Two central concerns for modern nation-state stability are *territorial integrity* in the face of external threats and internal disruption resulting from a lack of *social welfare*. To problematize these one must first consider our contemporary understanding of *popular sovereignty*. This task is the main intention of the article. The impact of supplanting monarchical absolutism in 1789 with a system of representative republic understood as more than just a viable option but the most practical and legitimate form of government

[1] Text of the Constitution in J. Godechot (comp.), *Les Constitutions de la France depuis 1789* (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1970), p. 38.

available to large territorial states cannot be exaggerated. Sieyes' political thought is thus of especial pertinence. His writings contained both a 'revolutionary doctrine' designed to establish why a break should be made with the ancien régime, and a 'constitutional doctrine' that provided the political programme that ought to be established in its place.[2] In Sieyes' nomenclature these were *la grande morale sociale*, and *la véritable science de l'ordre social*.[3] This article considers the two constituent elements, the nation, and state, as pertaining to the *moral* legitimizing and the *scientific* practical, a dialectic that is at the heart of Sieyes' understanding of 'national sovereignty'.

The article is formed in three sections; the first situates Sieyes' political thought within an intellectual framework, locating his conception of sovereignty historically. The second is a complimentary discussion of the political-economic basis for his understanding of the general will. Having addressed the essence of Sieyes' national sovereignty, the third considers the legal institutional element of his political programme. The article concludes that the intellectual implications of his conception of sovereignty bear heavily on the contempory ontology of the nation-state.

The Political Philosopher

The foundation of Sieyes' political thought is provided by three different but interrelated elements; two, the social contract and political economy, provide the basis for his 'revolutionary doctrine,' and the third, representation, his 'constitutional doctrine.'[4] These elements are addressed in turn, beginning with the social contract and the moral basis of national sovereignty.

Throughout the revolution France was viewed as a unitary state, most of those who sought to reformulate its social and political structures did not seek to dismantle absolutist territorial demarcation. The borders that constituted the new republic were those same that had defined the ancien régime. To consider the continuity between the two Frances it is necessary to account for how the absolutist monarchical state could become transfigured into its political opposite, the constitutional republic, and yet retain its geographical character. Crucially, to appreciate how the transformations of the revolution changed the nature of 'France' the elements of the state which cannot be captured by a simple spatial conception must be problematized. Therefore we now address the concept of the 'nation.

The Marquis d'Argenson remarked in the 1750s that the contemporary deployment of *état* and *nation* in political discourse would have been unthinkable in Louis XIV's time.[5] Before the period immediately preceding the revolution 'nation' had been used predominantly as a non- or pre-political designation applied to bodies of people associated by, *inter alia*, religion, geographical origin and socio-political rank, e.g. those individuals that made up the

[2] Forsyth, M., *Reason and Revolution: The Political Theory of the Abbe Sieyes'*, (New York: Leicester University Press, 1987), p.69.

[3] Sieyès, E., A. N. 284 AP 4, dossier 8, cited in P. Pasquino*,'Sieyès et l'invention de la constitution en France* (Paris: Odile Jacob, 1998), p. 166.

[4] Sewell, W., *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution: The Abbé Sieyes and What Is The Third Estate?* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994), p. 67.

[5] de Voyer de Paulmy, René-Louis , marquis d'Argenson in E.J.B. Rathery, *Journal et mémoires du Marquis d'Argenson publiés pour la première fois d'après les manuscrits autographes de la Bibliothèque du Louvre*, Vol.8 , (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1866), p. 315.

decision making element of a political entity. As Joseph-Henri Meister argued in response to Sieyes' *What Is The Third Estate?,* '[t]he nation really exists only among an elite of men chosen from among the different classes who compose it […] who have acquired the right to guide it.'[6]

Sieyes identified the nation *as* 'those different classes who compose it,' i.e. 'the people.'[7] For him the debate in 1789 over the future of the French polity operated only on a technical, functional level. He argued instead that intrinsic to this process the representative bodies called to the Estates General should consider the nature of those represented. However, as the Estates General was a composite body representing three distinct factions, Sieyes argued that disagreement between the factions was inevitable and perennial; any attempt to solve conflict would either result in an appeal to the higher power, i.e. the monarchy, or their respective constituents. This could only result in indecision.[8] *What Is The Third Estate?* is an attempt, therefore, to locate the legitimate basis of a *single* collective decision making polity with power over an unified community.

Sieyes offers a theoretical account of political multiplicity beginning with a condition of independent individuals in the state of nature that leads to a unified body with a consolidated will; this was 'the nation.'[9] This was operationalized by the social contract, a concept theorized by Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau. Sieyes' 'nation' is part of this intellectual legacy.

Hobbes conceived the lives of individuals in the state of nature as 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.'[10] Self-interest and the absence of checks and balances on individual behaviour proscribed societal formation. Thus Hobbes' social contract occurred as individuals collectively ceded their rights (sovereignty) so that others would give up theirs. This compact necessitated the establishment of society, and by extension, the state, a sovereign entity which protected the new right of individual corporeal preservation (from internal and external threats), and regulated interaction. In Hobbes' formulation the nation and the state are synonymous and the motivation of the social contract was security.

The distinctive element is that 'it is the Unity of the Representer, not the Unity of the Represented, that maketh the Person [i.e. the disembodied person of the state] One. And it is the Representer that beareth the Person, and but one Person: And Unity, cannot otherwise be understood in multitude.'[11] Sovereignty is of the multitude but not wielded by it. This precludes popular agency and provided the sovereign with an *active* legitimacy of coercion in the name of an imagined community.

Locke's conception of society arose from labour. Mankind's appropriation of nature through labour created property. 'The acorns he picked up under an oak, or the apples he gathered from the tree in the wood' are owned by the individual who engaged in that activity, as does

---

[6] de Maistre, J., *Des premiers principes du système social appliqués à la revolution présente* (Paris, 1790), pp. 49-50.

[7] Sieyès, 'Préliminaire de la Constitution Françoise', *Écrits Politiques* Paris: Baudoin, 1789), p. 200.

[8] Sieyès, '*What Is The Third Estate?*', M. Blondel (trans.), S.E. Finer (ed.), (London: Pall Mall, 1963), p. 130.

[9] Sieyès, 'What Is The Third Estate?', in M. Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003), p. 37.

[10] T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, R. Tuck (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge, 1991), p. 89.

[11] Ibid., p. 114.

'as much land as a man tills, plants, improves, cultivates, and can use the product of.'[12] Government forms when individuals communally establish a body to guarantee their property. Locke's social contract is thus an agreement to respect each other's property secured by a *passive* independent entity. Rousseau however was totally opposed to any authority based on property.

If we follow the progress of inequality in […] various revolutions, we shall find that the establishment of laws and of the right of property was its first term, the institution of magistracy the second, and the conversion of legitimate into arbitrary power the third and last; so that the condition of rich and poor was authorised by the first period; that of powerful and weak by the second; and only by the third that of master and slave, which is […] the term at which all the rest remain, […] till the government is […] dissolved by new revolutions.[13]

Rousseau's notion of the social contract was premised on the patriotism of human emotion as the basis of association. This patriotism formed a 'general will.'[14] Rousseau's social contract thus mitigates the nascent recourse to despotism implicit in Hobbes' formulation as the individual associates remain *liberated*. Sieyes however didn't accept that transcendental emotions could provide a sufficient attachment to a social whole.[15]

The three above models are two tier models, i.e. *initially* mankind exists in a state of nature, and *subsequently* becomes unified in society. Sieyes' model added a third tier. In the first stage of '*individual wills'* Sieyes describes a multitude of isolated individuals who desire unification. Even at this stage the rights of the nation are extant. The second stage is conceived as an association of rational individuals who all mutually agree on public needs then form a communal body to serve the '*common will'*. Sieyes' third stage is necessitated by the demographic/geographical growth of the associates who can no longer practically make mutual agreements. Hence they nominate a system of 'government by proxy' where 'all that is needed for overseeing and providing for public concerns' is entrusted to a representative body. Here we see the legacy of Rousseau, as the multitude remains liberated by the retention of its 'right of will.' This is considered 'inalienable.' At this stage of '*representative common will*,' Sieyes begins to use the term 'national.'[16]

Sieyes considered the representative common will a deductive premise that inculcated all assertions regarding societal interaction. 'Every attribute of nation springs from the simple fact that it exists,' owing its existence 'to natural law alone.'[17] However, his understanding of national sovereignty was premised by more than just moral sentiment; there was a material core to Sieyes' philosophy.

[12] Locke, J., *Two Treatises of Government,* 2nd Ed., P. Laslett (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), pp. 329-30, 332.
[13] Rousseau, J.J., 'Discourse on the Origins of Inequality', Available from *http://www.constitution.org/jjr/ineq_04.htm*, (Date Accessed: 21.05.2011).
[14] Rousseau, 'The Social Contract - Book IV', Available from *http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfbits/rcont4.pdf*, (Date Accessed: 24.05. 2011).
[15] Sieyes, A.N. 284 AP 5, dossier 1, cited in Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, p. lvii.
[16] Sieyes, 'What Is The Third Estate?', in Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, pp. 136-137.
[17] Sieyes, '*What Is The Third Estate?*', Blondel (trans.), Finer (ed.), p. 128.

The Political-Economist

What does a nation need to survive and prosper? It needs private activities and public services.[18] Sieyes rejected Rousseau's ideas on the nature of sociability; his position was more akin to Locke's. In contrast to the Greco-Roman model of virtue as the basis of representative states, Sieyes believed that material well-being was the defining goal of populous European states. 'Modern European peoples bear little resemblance to the ancients. Among us it is always a question of commerce, agriculture, manufactures, etc. […] Hence political systems, today, are founded exclusively on labour.'[19] Given that the dire state of the French economy caused by the failure of the French military-fiscal regime had prompted the first Estates General since 1614, this appears a pragmatic position. Sieyes believed that an abstract contract or existing judiciary could never build a coherent nation. One may exist legally or coercively but without consent this form of 'nation' could never be sustainable and must succumb to the social contradictions of its imposition, as evidenced in revolutionary France. 'Every man wishes to be happy, that is, to enjoy himself as he pleases. Enjoyment consumes goods; an ever-acting force that produces new ones is therefore needed […] General labour is therefore the foundation of society, and the social order is nothing but the best possible order of labour.'[20]

For Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau an individual who broke communal law gave up their rights to citizenship, and became a *legal* criminal subject to the state's coercive prerogative. Sieyes applied this principle to the *economic* sphere. 'If there is a citizen who refuses his portion of activity he renounces his rights; no man may enjoy the labour of others without exchange.'[21] The unproductive nobility are cast as more than superfluous but actively damaging to society.

This sentiment imbues the first paragraphs of *What Is The Third Estate?,* and provides the basis for Sieyes' arguments on the proper constitution of the nation-state. In the prevailing hierarchy of the Estates system, the clergy, responsible for spiritual matters, were ranked highest, next were the nobility who were charged with the defence of the realm and supporting the monarch. All others resided in the Third Estate, which was responsible for the state's material livelihood. The state itself was reified in the person of the monarch, exemplified by Louis XV's claim to sovereignty 'without dependence and without partners.'[22]

Sieyes reformulates this understanding of social order as one based on productive proximity to nature; from agriculture (the exploitation of resources), to industry (the creation of commodities by labour), to commerce (trade in commodities), and finally to services (which don't create tangible value). The axis on which society is ordered transforms from a

[18] Sieyès, *Vues sur les moyens dont les représentants de la France pourront diposer en 1789*, (1798), p. 4.
[19] Sieyès, 'Dire de l'Abbé Sieyès sur la question du veto Royal', pp. 13-14; in E. Sieyès, *Ecrits Politiques,* R. Zapperi (ed.), (Paris: Editions des Archives Contemporaines, 1985), p. 236.
[20] Sieyes, 'Letters to the Economists', in *Ecrits Politiques*, p. 32.
[21] Sieyes, 'Letters to the Economists', in *Ecrits Politiques*, p. 32.
[22] Louis XV, 'March 3, 1766', in J. Flammermont (ed.), *Remonstrances du Parlement de Paris au XVIIÎ siècle,* Vol.2 (1755-1768), (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1895), p. 557.

political-spiritual one to a material one.[23] There is no place is this reformulation for the nobility. Sieyes thus employs revolutionary doctrine to justify constitutional change.
Two additional principles of Sieyes' political-economy deserve attention. Having established that 'social order is […] the best possible order of labour,' he expands the point. First, each man acquires alone nearly all his goods. Their number increases with the means, and as these become more complicated, divisions of labour form; the common advantage requires this, because labourers are less distracted by cares of the same nature than they would be by occupations of different kinds; they therefore tend to produce greater effects with fewer means.[24] This conception of the division of labour is almost identical to Adam Smith's version. However, Sieyes expands the economic definition to include the notion of representation noted above. Sieyes' understanding of representation was informed by the division of labour. Referring to his extension of Smith's ideas he remarked:

I had also considered the distribution of the great professions or trades as the true principle of the progress of society. All of this is only a portion of my representative order in private relations. *To have oneself/let oneself be represented is the only source of civil prosperity* […] Multiply the means/powers to satisfy our needs; enjoy more, work less, this is the natural increase in liberty in society. But this progress of liberty follows naturally from the establishment of *representative labour*.[25]

Sieyes uses representation as specialization in production *and* as a political principal. His idea of the 'representative common will' in societal evolution occasions an incorporation of political economy into the prevailing revolutionary discourse of the day, i.e. the social contract. Thus, the material is implicated in the social theory of national sovereignty. 'I would even say that representation is confounded with the very essence of social life.'[26] Moreover Sieyes asserts that the level at which a society has divided its labour is indicative of its advancement; as such the natural increase in liberty that division of labour allows was crucial to the application of a representative political system to a large, territorial state like France.

A corollary element was free competition. We have noted how Sieyes employed the centrality of production in social order to deny the nobility a position in the private sphere, however it is with free competition that he completes the logic by denying them a position in the public. The traditional realms of aristocratic national contribution were those distinguished areas of the judiciary, the military and administration. Whilst Sieyes did not deny that some nobles did perform useful service, he argued that the vast majority of work was performed by the Third Estate with the nobles reserving the 'lucrative and honorific posts' for themselves.[27]

Do we not know the effects of monopoly? If it discourages those it excludes, does it not also destroy the skills of those if favours? Are we unaware that any work from which free

[23] Sieyes, 'What Is The Third Estate?', in Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, pp. 94-95.
[24] Sieyès, 'Letters to the Economists', in *Ecrits Politiques*, p. 33.
[25] Sieyès, '*Ecrits Politiques'*, p. 62. Emphasis in original.
[26] Sieyès, '*Opinion de Sieyès, sur plusieurs articles des titres IV et V du projet de constitution, propose à la Convention le 9 thermidor de l'an troisième de la République'*, (Paris, year III), p. 5.
[27] Sieyes, '*What Is The Third Estate?*', Blondel (trans.), Finer (ed.), p. 122.

competition is excluded will be performed less well and more expensively? […] *The supposed utility of a privileged order for public service is but a chimera*.[28]
Only when occupations are open to all will they be filled by the most competent.
Society, as Sieyes conceived it, was a liberating project for the perfected pursuit of wealth proceeding via a division of labour facilitated by free competition. In contrast to laissez faire markets, however, Sieyes advocated an *active* role for the state in the provision of necessary infrastructures. The central claim of *What is the Third Estate?*, i.e. that the Third Estate is everything and the nobility nothing, is thus premised on a societal model incorporating Sieyes's political economy.

The Political Scientist

What is a nation? It is a body of associates living under a common law represented by the same legislature.[29] Pre-revolutionary France did not have a universally applicable set of laws. The monarchy, the clergy, the nobility and the Third Estate were not formally equal; each class was subject to a different law. The implication of the above statement is that France, before the Third Estate dissolved the Estates-General and proclaimed itself a National Assembly, was not a nation as it didn't have the legal preconditions of nationhood. There was *a* nation in France but it was not *the* nation. We have seen how Sieyes had provided the intellectual and the political-economic justification for a unified nation, but this needed to be articulated in the political infrastructure to complete Sieyes' political programme. It is important to meditate here on the significance of Sieyes' ideas; the *abstract* sovereign nation becomes intrinsic to the *concrete* state. This is, then, the modern conception of the nation-state.

The system by which Sieyes the political scientist proposed to operationalize this fusion was 'a *representative* establishment based on *individual liberty*.'[30] Thus his philosophical and material contentions shaped his political science. His impersonal system of rule would be based on what Sieyes called an 'electual system.'[31] Its integrative principle would not be Rousseau's patriotism, but *adunation*, the process by which a hierarchical representative institution transformed the many interests making up a large, populous society into a unified nation-state. Its moral counterpart would be 'assimilation', or the principals that different members would come to hold in common. 'Assimilation,' Sieyes noted, 'is to manners as adunation is to interests.'[32]

Essentially Sieyes advocated a functionalist bureaucratic approach to modern state building. His system was not the commonly understood form of indirect election but instead prescribed a system of promotion whereby eligibility was dependent on having first served in the office directly below.[33] All aspiring politicians, as formal equals, would enter at the

[28] Ibid., p. 122-123. Emphasis added.
[29] Sieyès, 'What Is The Third Estate?', in Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, p. 97.
[30] Sieyès, A.N. 284 AP 5, dossier 1², cited in Michael Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, p. xvii.
[31] Sieyès, A. N. 284 AP 4, dossier 7, in C. Fauré, J. Guilhaumou and J. Valier (eds.), *Des Manuscrits de Sieyès: 1773-1799* (Paris: Champion, 1999), p. 460.
[32] Sieyès, A. N. 284 AP 4, dossier 11, cited in Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, p. x.
[33] M. Sonenscher, *Before The Deluge: Public Debt, Inequality, and the Intellectual Origins of the French Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), p. 77.
[33] Sieyes, A.N. 284 AP 5, dossier 1², cited in Michael Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, p. xvii.
[33] Sieyès, A. N. 284 AP 4, dossier 7, in C. Fauré, J. Guilhaumou and J. Valier (eds.), *Des Manuscrits de Sieyès:*

bottom and could only proceed to the next stage by having served at the lower level *and* being the successful candidate. In contrast to the predominant republican conception of a platform-shaped representative system, Sieyes' form was pyramid-shaped and came to a point; thus it was technically monarchical. However, unlike the extant absolutist monarchy, where sovereignty is held in the person at the top, Sieyes' 'polyarchy' located sovereignty at the base within the represented electorate.[34] The function of this system was to provide a meritocratic hierarchy that restricted the parasitical privilege of earlier forms.

Sieyes witnessed the establishment of a common law in France with the evolution of the National Assembly but his electoral system was never fully implemented. However, for him the task of the philosopher was to provide the moral justification and logical sequence of options open to society, i.e. to provide the theory of transformation. It was the administrator's role to realise these ideas through praxis.[35] Nevertheless, Sieyes' thought provides a real insight into the intellectual heritage of what has become the basis of liberal political and economic life, that is, the analytical separation and functional reconciliation of those two spheres.

Sieyes' national sovereignty is located between monarchical absolutism and popular sovereignty. It was an attempt to reconcile centralised political authority with individual economic liberty in a progressive age. Sieyes saw the aristocracy as a backward institution. Progress could not ensue whilst privilege held back the entrepreneurial vigour of the citizen. The language that Sieyes uses to justify his assertions attests to his sense of development over time. He attributes to the old order the use of history as legitimation of their position in society.

Thus if historical precedence is the basis of the dysfunctional French polity it must be discarded as the intellectual source of political systems. Sieyes instead engages in a serious scientific re-evaluation that takes as its point of departure the nation as a self-evident truth. However, history is not seen as irrelevant, as Sieyes' writings were always grounded explicitly in socio-temporal specificity. Crucially, his political thought was not sanctioned by history but theorised in history. 'What, pray, is theory unless it is that connected sequence of truths that you might not be able to see until it has been made real but which someone has to have seen […]?'[36] Previously the state/nation complex was defined by its ancestral nature, hence the framing of political debate in comparative historical terms, especially in relation to classical civilization. With Sieyes the historical axis of societal development becomes inverted; as constituent elements of the nation, Sieyes offers communities of individuals the transformative potential to shape society.

After Sieyes' reformulation of the nation-state symbiosis, the nation becomes defined by its relation to the state. No longer is the nation essentially determined by the dialectic of domination between it and 'other' nations, instead the central dialectic is between the

---

1773-1799 (Paris: Champion, 1999), p. 460.

[33] Sieyes, A. N. 284 AP 4, dossier 11, cited in Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, p. x.

[33] M. Sonenscher, *Before The Deluge: Public Debt, Inequality, and the Intellectual Origins of the French Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), p. 77.

[34] Sieyès, 'The Debate between Sieyes and Tom Paine', in Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, p.169.

[35] Sieyès, 'Views of the Executive Means', in Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings*, p.7.

[36] Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès, 'What Is The Third Estate?', in Michael Sonenscher (ed.) and (trans.), *Political Writings* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003), p. 161.

pouvoir constituent (sovereignty) and the *pouvoir constitué* (government). This is not to say that external relations cease to be a concern for nation-states, far from it, it is to recognise that the essential function of the modern nation is to successfully regulate the administration of the state.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Forsyth, Murray, *Reason and Revolution: The Political Theory of the Abbe Sieyes* (New York: Leicester University Press, 1987).

Godechot, Jacques, comp., *Les Constitutions de la France depuis 1789* (Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1970).

de Maistre, Joseph, *Des premiers principes du système social appliqués à la revolution présente* (Paris: 1790).

Pasquino, Pasquale, *Sieyès et l'invention de la constitution en France* (Paris : Odile Jacob, 1998).

Rousseau, Jean J., 'The Social Contract, Book IV' available from *http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfbits/rcont4.pdf*, (Date Accessed: 24.05.2011).

Rousseau, Jean J., 'Discourse on the Origins of Inequality', Available from *http://www.constitution.org/jjr/ineq_04.htm*, (Date Accessed: 21.05.2011).

Sewell, William, *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution: The Abbé Sieyes and What Is The Third Estate?* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1994).

Sieyès, Emmanuel-Joseph, *Vues sur les moyens dont les représentants de la France pourront diposer en 1789* (1798).

Sieyès, Emmanuel-Joseph, Préliminaire de la Constitution Françoise', *Écrits Politiques* (Paris: Baudoin: 1789).

Sieyès, Emmanuel-Joseph, *Opinion de Sieyès, sur plusieurs articles des titres IV et V du projet de constitution, propose à la Convention le 9 thermidor de l'an troisième de la République* (Paris, year III).

Sonenscher, Michael, *Before The Deluge: Public Debt, Inequality, and the Intellectual Origins of the French Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

Secondary Sources

Fauré, Christine, Jacques Guilhaumou and Jacques Valier, eds., *Des Manuscrits de Sieyès: 1773-1799* (Paris : Champion, 1999).

Flammermont, Jules, ed., '*Remonstrances du Parlement de Paris au XVIIĨ siècle',* Vol.2 (1755-1768), (Paris : Imprimerie Nationale, 1895).

Hobbes, Thomas, '*Leviathan'*, Richard Tuck, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Locke, John, '*Two Treatises of Government'*, 2nd Ed., Peter Laslett, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967).

Rathery, E. J. B., (ed.), *Journal et mémoires du Marquis d'Argenson publiés pour la première fois d'apres les manuscrits autographes de la Bibliothèque du Louvre,* Vol. 8, (Paris : Jules Renouard, Paris, 1866).

Sieyès, Emmanuel-Joseph, *'What Is The Third Estate?'* in ed. S.E. Finer, M. Blondel, trans., (London: Pall Mall, 1963).

Sieyès, Emmanuel-Joseph, *Ecrits Politiques* in ed. Roberto Zapperi (Paris : Editions des Archives Contemporaines, 1985).

Sonenscher, Michael, ed. and trans., *Political Writings* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2003).

Women, the People's Peace and Conservative Defeat: Why did the Conservatives lose the 1945 General Election?

Dominic Butler

BA History, University of Sussex (Brighton, UK)

Abstract: In 1945 the Conservatives suffered a humiliating defeat in the General Election. Labour had won by a landslide of 180 seats and formed the new government. Historians have looked to the popular policies of the Clement Atlee and the Labour Party to explain their success. This article takes an alternative approach and looks to the experience, decisions and policies of Winston Churchill and the Conservative Party to explain their defeat in the election, unexpected after they had won the war. The article makes the argument that it was Churchill and his Party's failure to empathize with the people and to offer the peace they desired. They were particularly out of touch with the interests of women who constituted a significant proportion of the 1945 electorate after decades of the struggle for Women's suffrage.

Keywords: Winston Churchill; Conservative Party; Labour Party; General Election; War; People's Peace; New Generation; Women.

"It may all indeed be a blessing in disguise".[1] Churchill wrote to Clementine on 5 September 1945 from Italy whilst relaxing after the Conservatives defeat in the General Election. In the letter Churchill tells of how relieved he is that others will have to deal with the aftermath of the War. Albeit, he also writes that in the last 10 days the rupture from his childhood has returned and he must wear a truss for the rest of his life. He had not worn the truss for 60 years and through "much rough and tumble". It is possible that the defeat after the War had a greater impact than Churchill was willing to divulge.

This essay is concerned with causation and Churchill's reaction reveals a possible cause of the Conservatives defeat in the 1945 General Election. Churchill was confident of victory, which shows how detached he was from the British People, as the Gallup Poll predicted a Labour victory with 47% of the votes.[2] Churchill's unawareness of the changing mood in Britain meant that his policies and campaigns were ineffective and often, as with his first broadcast of the election campaign, worsened his chances of wining the election. The British people, primarily the working classes had fought hard for their country and were exhausted by total war, they expected the country to repay them with a better life.[3] J.B. Priestley's

[1] 'Winston Churchill in a letter to Clementine Churchill, 5 September, 1955', in, Soames, Mary (ed.) *Speaking for Themselves, The Personal Letters of Winston and Clementine Churchill*, (London: Doubleday, 1999), Chap. XXIV.

[2] Butler, David, *British general elections since 1945,* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989), p.106.

[3] Pelling, Henry, 'The 1945 General Election Reconsidered', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 2, (Cambridge:

famous Dunkirk broadcast spoke of a People's Peace to follow the People's War.[4] Labour were greatly aware of what the people wanted and offered them an extensive People's Peace.

While the Labour Party's welfare policies and election campaign were dominant reasons for the Conservative defeat. This essay will take a different approach and focus primarily on Conservative failures, which have received less attention. Firstly the essay will analyze Churchill's role in the defeat of the Conservative Party. Secondly the essay will analyze the Conservative Party, the historical experience of failure in the inter-war period and its failure to adapt to the changing mood in Britain. Finally, the essay will analyze the role of Women in the defeat of the Conservative Party, which has been neglected by historians.

Winston S. Churchill is often regarded as the savoir of the Conservative Party preventing them from an even greater defeat. McCallum and Readman argue that because of Churchill the Conservative party did so well as to save 200 seats.[5] Churchill may have saved seats but he also lost seats in the months running up to 1945. Lord Moran Churchill's Doctor in his diaries tells of how Churchill believed his broadcasts were gaining ground when they were actually losing him support.[6] The infamous Gestapo broadcast, the first of his campaign was very damaging to the Conservative election campaign as it portrayed him as ungrateful for the Labour party's support during the war and in some ways hysterical. Many believed the attack on socialism was uncalled for. Clementine had warned him, as did his daughter Sarah in a letter that arrived too late.[7]

The Conservative Henry Channon complained after the election result in commiseration to Churchill, that the British public was ungrateful. Churchill dismissed this comment, saying that, "they have had a hard time".[8] He himself was not grateful for the unrelenting support he had received from Clement Attlee and Ernest Bevin who he had repaid with an anti-Socialist outburst. Churchill was in part responsible for making Socialism respectable and therefore should have realized that the British public would not accept his outburst.[9] Clementine is recorded by Moran as explaining that by no fault of his own but because of his upbringing and life experiences Churchill was selfish.[10] He could only see the world through blinkers, and while he saw a return to pre-war life, which Conservatives so cherished, Labour and the majority of British people saw dramatic change.

David Cannandine argued that Churchill's Victorian identity along with his negative speeches devoid of constructive thought did not convince Britons that he could offer solutions and bring about the change that they desired in peace.[11] Colonel P.B. Blair said, "Churchill is

---

Cambridge
University Press, Jun 1980), pp.399-413.

[4] Smith, Harold, *Britain and the Second World War: A Social History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), pp.1-27.

[5] McCallum, Ronald B. and Readman, Alison, *The British General Election of 1945* (London: Macmillan, 1947), p.170.

[6] Lord Moran, *Winston Churchill, The struggle for survival, 1940-1965,* (London: Heron Books, 1996), p.253.

[7] Gilbert, Martin, *Never Despair: Winston S. Churchill, 1945-65* (London: Heinemann, 1988), p.35.

[8] Ibid., p.35.

[9] 'Extracts from the Diaries of Sir Cuthbert Morley Headlam' in Ball, Stuart (ed.), *Parliament and politics in the age of Churchill and Attlee: the Headlam diaries 1876-1964* (Cambridge, 1999), p.470.

[10] Lord Moran, p.247.

[11] Cannadine, David, *In Churchill's Shadow* (London: Allen Lane, 2002), p.97.

good in War but will not do in peace".[12] He was, however a hindrance to the campaign rather than responsible for defeat of the Conservative Party. The Gallup poll 6th and 13th June 1945 revealed that 84% of people had already decided their vote, so Churchill's electoral campaign would only have affected the small undecided proportion of people, which would not affect the outcome when Labour gained a 180 seat majority.[13] That is not to say that people's minds are unchangeable and defeat was inevitable, but it is likely that Churchill's campaign had little affect. John Charmley argues that Churchill could have changed the outcome, however, what is important is that he did not and when comparing the figures with the results of the election McCallum and Readman found most people had stuck to their decided vote.[14] The Conservative party took on the reform package in a less radical form but it was not as appealing, as it was not as far-reaching and the party had a reputation for failure from the interwar-period.

The Conservative Party was Victorian and outdated and was seen to be a failure after the Premierships of Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain. Cannandine argues that Victorian values were unpopular, while Churchill was more progressive he still held on to the out of date Victorian values that were associated with failure.[15] A.P.J. Taylor makes the argument that the historical experience of Conservative failure to deliver from 1918 to 1940 was a reason for their defeat.[16] Stanley Baldwin the Victorian rural romantic is held responsible for the hardship and industrial decline in the inter-war years.[17] The Victorian Conservative ideology of tradition and returning to normality after the war was not appealing to post-Second World War Britain's who had fought not to return to a life of squalor and wage-slavery. Phillip Masheder explains that he voted Labour because the servicemen deserved a "fair share" because they defended the country and the landowner's land, which otherwise they would have lost to the Germans.[18] Churchill's problem with "fair-shares for all" was not that the people did not deserve it but that it meant "equal shares for all" and would destroy the Victorian work ethic that had won the war.[19]

Stanley Baldwin's inter-war government was associated with mass unemployment in the 1930's Great Depression, which made the electorate worry about the Conservative Party's economic capability. Employment was a crucial issue for soldiers due to return home as well as all those who were employed for the war effort. With the end of war comes unemployment with the decline in manufacturing and the return of soldiers. John Maynard Keynes however offered the solution that was intended to produce full employment through government fiscal and monetary policy.[20] Churchill influenced by Hayek's *Road to Serfdom*

[12] Gilbert, p.10.

[13] McCallum and Readman, p.269.

[14] Charmley, John, *Churchill: The End of Glory,* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1993).

[15] Cannadine, p.182.

[16] Franklin, Mark and Ladner, Matthew, 'The Undoing of Winston Churchill: Mobilization and Conversion in the 1945 Realignment of British Voters', *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 25, No.4 (Oct 1995), pp. 429-452, p.431.

[17] Cannadine, p.182.

[18] Addison, Paul, *Now the War is Over: Social History of Britain from 1945-1951,* (London: Cape/BBC Publications, 1985), p.12.

[19] Wrigley, Chris, *Churchill* (London: Haus, 2006), p.109.

[20] Kynaston, David, *Austerity Britain, 1945-51* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007), pp.64-80.

criticized the mixed economy in his election campaign while the Labour Party supported Keynesian economics.[21]

The Conservatives were also regarded as failures with foreign policy after Neville Chamberlain's policy of appeasement, which many blamed for Britain's entry to the War and therefore suffering. Although Churchill was successful in the War he was not necessarily going to be a success with foreign policy during peace. Domestic policy was on the minds of British people so foreign policy was avoided in party literature, especially the issue of how to deal with post–war Germany.[22] Conservative's ideas on foreign policy was that it is a matter of trusting in Leaders to do their best in a difficult situation. Although Churchill was trustworthy this did not extend to the other Conservatives who were associated with Baldwin and Chamberlain. Labour on the other hand achieved victory in the General Election through its new gained trust and experience serving in the War coalition and popular polices.

Historians have overlooked the role of women in the Conservatives defeat. They have been relegated to a feature of the generational change in voters. When in actual fact they constituted a considerable proportion of the electorate. Many women also stood as nominees for the House of Commons, possibly up to 1,700 in total.[23] The political scientists Mark Franklin and Mathew Ladner argued that the Conservatives defeat in the 1945 General Election was not caused by Churchill's campaign errors but the coming-of-age of a new political generation.[24] The majority of the new generation of voters were 'socialized' as they had been brought up in Labour households, which were encouraged to vote by the party and trade unions. Women were a substantial proportion of these young new voters and combined with the older women who could vote in the 1930 and 1935 election formed a substantial proportion the electorate. Martin Pugh argued that after the success of Women as Members of Parliament there was speculation that there would be a Women's Party in the General Election. However, this never happened because women were active in the Labour party holding conferences in 1940, 1942, 1943 and 1945.[25]

The Labour party was more appealing to women than the Conservative party because of its domestic welfare policies. After their lives had been devastated by total war women where concerned with rebuilding their homes and the provision for work, food, education and healthcare. While both parties encouraged domesticity, Lucy Noakes argued that the Labour party offered a good domestic life.[26] The Conservatives also tended to represent a male dominated world with fewer female candidates than the Labour party and a repressed Women's organization that did not meet between 1939 and 1946.[27] Penny Summerfield argued that the Conservatives were made unpopular amongst women as they were seen to support middle-class women that did not participate fully in the War effort, unlike Churchill's daughter Sarah who was in the WAAF.[28] Albeit, the representation of middle-class wealthy

[21] Wood, Ian S., *Churchill,* (London, 2000), p.135.
[22] McCallum and Readman, p.170.
[23] Pugh, Martin, *Women and the Women's Movement in Britain, 1914-1999* (London: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p. 280.
[24] Franklin and Ladner.
[25] Pugh, p.280.
[26] Noakes, Lucy, *Women in the British Army: War and the Gentle Sex, 1907-1948* (London: Routledge, 2006), p.138.
[27] Pugh, p.280.
[28] Summerfield, Penny, *Reconstructing Women's Wartime Lives: Discourse and Subjectivity in Oral History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), pp.163-4.

women as idle created animosity amongst the "good women" as Priestly calls them.[29] Sarah informed her father after his Gestapo speech of socialism's popularity in the WAAF as it had done,

nobody any harm and some people a whole lot of good…the children of this country have never been so well fed.[30]

Sarah asked her father of his housing policy that he had mentioned once, but has not stuck in the minds of WAAF women. Whereas, the Labour party realized the importance of the female vote and its campaigns reflected this portraying a "fair share" that was universal. Their posters presented women proclaiming that, "I'll vote for him!"[31] Women were called upon to vote for their absent husbands and although Labour did not abandon its focus on the male vote it gained the support of women, a large electoral group.

To conclude, the Conservatives lost the General election because of the historical experience of Britons, the failure of Baldwin and Chamberlain and the failure to adapt to the changing mood, as they did not understand what the people wanted. Churchill was culpable for not realizing what the people wanted and failing to appeal to the working classes and in particular women, who were a substantial proportion of the electorate and concerned greatly with the domestic future of Britain. Sarah had attempted to enlighten her father to the prevailing mood of socialism in Britain and the need for a "People's Peace" to rebuild a different Britain, as it was a time when the people could make dramatic changes.[32] The majority of the working classes and a proportion of the middle classes were unwilling to return to pre-war Britain, which the Conservatives advocated. Socialism as Sarah informed her father had already done a whole lot of good in which the Conservatives were involved, as with R.A. Butler's Education Act 1944 and the Family Allowances Act 1945. However, the Conservatives manifesto was political and did not offer any great social changes that would benefit the "People" and in particular women, who were encouraged to return to their homes, to find very little waiting for them if they voted Conservative.[33]

Women were a decisive factor in the Conservatives defeat and Labour's victory, as they kept Britain functioning during the war, with 7,250,000 directly involved in the war effort.[34] They would vote for Labour in order to rebuild their homes, feed and educate their children, provide health care for their family and bring their husbands home as quickly as possible. The Labour party captured the "People's Peace" and used it effectively with the trust of the British people after five years in the coalition government, to win the election by a landslide and create a post-war consensus that would dominate Britain until the 1980's.

[29] Ibid., p. 164.
[30] Wrigley, p.98.
[31] Butler, pp.7-8.
[32] Gilbert, p.35.
[33] Lord Moran, p.251.
[34] Pugh, p.265.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Ball, Stuart, (ed.) *Parliament and politics in the age of Churchill and Attlee: the Headlam diaries 1876-1964*, (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1999).

McCallum, Ronald B., and Readman, Alison, *The British general election of 1945* (London: Macmillan, 1947).

Lord Moran, *Winston Churchill: The struggle for survival, 1940-1965* (London: Heron Books, 1966).

Soames, Mary, (ed.) *Speaking for Themselves, The Personal Letters of Winston and Clementine Churchill* (London: Doubleday, 1998).

Secondary Sources

Addison, Paul, *Now the War is Over: Social History of Britain from 1945-1951* (London: Cape/BBC Publications, 1985).

Butler, David, *British general elections since 1945*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).

Cannadine, David, *In Churchill's Shadow* (London: Allen Lane, 2002).

Charmley, John, *Churchill: The End of Glory* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1993).

Franklin, Mark and Ladner, Matthew, 'The Undoing of Winston Churchill: Mobilization and Conversion in the 1945 Realignment of British Voters', *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 25, No.4 (Oct 1995), pp. 429-452.

Gilbert, Martin, *Never Despair: Winston Churchill, 1945*-65 (London: Heinemann, 1988).

Kynaston, David, *Austerity Britain, 1945-51* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007).

Noakes, Lucy, *Women in the British Army: War and the Gentle Sex, 1907-1948* (London: Routledge, 2006).

Pelling, Henry, 'The 1945 General Election Reconsidered', *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 2, (Jun 1980), pp. 399-414.

Pugh, Martin, *Women and the Women's Movement in Britain, 1914-1999*, (London: St. Martin's Press, 2000).

Smith, Harold, *Britain and the Second World War: A Social History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996)

Summerfield, Penny, *Reconstructing Women's Wartime Lives: Discourse and Subjectivity in Oral History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).

Wood, Ian S., *Churchill* (London: St Martin's Press, 2000).

Wrigley, Chris, *Churchill* (London: Haus, 2006).