

ORIGINAL PASSAGE

In the height of the Enlightenment, men influenced by the new political theories of the era launched two of the largest revolutions in history. These two conflicts, on two separate continents, were both initially successful in forming new forms of government. And yet, the two conflicts, though merely a decade apart, had radically different conclusions. How do two wars inspired by more or less the same ideals end up so completely different? Why was the American Revolution largely a success and the French Revolution largely a failure? Historians have pointed to myriad reasons—far too various to be listed here. However, the most frequently cited are worth mentioning. For one, the American Revolution was far removed from the Old World; that is, since it was on a different continent, other European nations did not attempt to interfere with it. However, in the French Revolution, there were immediate cries for war from neighboring nations. Early on, for instance, the ousted king attempted to flee to neighboring Austria and the army waiting there. The newly formed French Republic also warred with Belgium, and a conflict with Britain loomed. Thus, the French had the burden not only of winning a revolution but also defending it from outside. The Americans simply had to win a revolution. Secondly, the American Revolution seemed to have a better chance for success from the get-go, due to the fact that Americans already saw themselves as something other than British subjects. Thus, there was already a uniquely American character, so, there was not as loud a cry to preserve the British way of life. In France, several thousands of people still supported the king, largely because the king was seen as an essential part of French life. And when the king was first ousted and then killed, some believed that character itself was corrupted. Remember, the Americans did not oust a king or kill him—they merely separated from him. Finally, there is a general agreement that the French were not as unified as the Americans, who, for the most part, put aside their political differences until after they had already formed a new nation. The French, despite their Tennis Court Oath, could not do so. Infighting led to inner turmoil, civil war, and eventually the Reign of Terror, in which political dissidents were executed in large numbers. Additionally, the French people themselves were not unified. The nation had so much stratification that it was impossible to unite all of them—the workers, the peasants, the middle-class, the nobles, the clergy—into one cause. And the attempts to do so under a new religion, the Divine Cult of Reason, certainly did not help. The Americans, remember, never attempted to change the society at large; rather, they merely attempted to change the government.

1. Why and how did the Reign of Terror happen?
2. In what ways does the author suggest that the American Revolution was easier to complete than the French Revolution?
3. Of the challenges mentioned facing the French revolutionaries, which do you think had the greatest impact on their inability to complete a successful revolution? Why?
4. Of the strengths mentioned aiding the American revolutionaries, which do you think had the greatest impact on their ability to complete a successful revolution? Why

Why and how did the Reign of Terror happen?

During the American Revolution, Americans just fought to acquire freedom from British. They never attempted to kill or detain the British king, rather all the states of US remained united for their struggle for independence and they just ended the British rule. On the other hand, French during their struggle to end the injustice happening to the commoners, crossed the red line by detailing and killing the king, as many people in France still had sympathy for him. Moreover, French people themselves were divided into different groups unlike Americans regardless of their Tennis Court Oath. This led to reign of terror in France where thousands were killed including the main leaders who led the revolution.

In what ways does the author suggest that the American Revolution was easier to complete than the French Revolution?

America was far away rest of the world due to which there was less foreign intervention in the matter during the revolution. Moreover, Americans during their struggle to acquire freedom from British had clear goal of being different from British and need of independent nation which brought them into unity regardless of their internal conflicts. Due to these reasons American evolution was easier to complete than French Revolution.

Of the challenges mentioned facing the French revolutionaries, which do you think had the greatest impact on their inability to complete a successful revolution? Why?

In France during the time of revolution there was no unity. Majority of the people although hated the king due to his incapability and injustice but thousands of French still supported the king. This division; later, after the killing of the king resulted in conflicts amongst both the groups and it turned the Revolution into terror ultimately resulting in failure of the revolution.

Of the strengths mentioned aiding the American revolutionaries, which do you think had the greatest impact on their ability to complete a successful revolution? Why

All the states of America during their struggle against the British remained united. They fought against the British rule with clear goal i.e. to end the British government and live with freedom. This unity helped them in their revolution and made it successful.

ORIGINAL PASSAGE

Probably the only protection for contemporary man is to discover how to use his intelligence in the service of love and kindness. The training of human intelligence must include the simultaneous development of the empathic capacity. Only in this way can intelligence be made an instrument of social morality and responsibility – and thereby increase the chances of survival. The need to produce human beings with trained morally sensitive intelligence is essentially a challenge to educators and educational institutions. Traditionally, the realm of social morality was left to religion and the churches as guardians or custodians. But their failure to fulfil this responsibility and their yielding to the seductive lures of the men of wealth and pomp and power are documented by history of the last two thousand years and have now resulted in the irrelevant “God Is Dead” theological rhetoric. The more pragmatic men of power have had no time or inclination to deal with the fundamental problems of social morality. For them simplistic Machiavellianism must remain the guiding principle of their decisions – power is morality, morality is power. This over-simplification increases the chances of nuclear evastation. We must therefore hope that educators and educational institutions have the capacity, the commitment and the time to in-still moral sensitivity as an integral part of the complex pattern of functional human intelligence. Some way must be found in the training of human beings to give them the assurance to love, the security to be kind, and the integrity required for a functional empathy.

Precis

To avoid conflicts among humans, it is essential to teach them kindness in order to make them socially moral and responsible. However, it remains a challenge for the educators to do the same. The said job was designated to religious clerics before; however, they have not only failed in their objective but also have caused a damage to reputation of religion. Current famed principle of life i.e. "Power is morality" can further lead to nuclearization of the world. In this regard, educators have to take this responsibility to teach the humans kindness, love and tolerance to prevent escalation.

Title: Role of education in social morality

Total Words: 251

Precis Words: 98