

The Enlightenment in Broad Perspectives

Meshack M. Sagini, Ph.D.

Benard M. Manyibe Ed.D.

Langston University
Oklahoma, USA

Abstract

Various civilizations define the term Enlightenment differently because they understand it from the view point of their cultural, historical, psychological and moral values. However, the 17th and 18th century Eurocentric intellectual universe was employed to broaden, without thinking of its risks to the larger human community, the new ways of reasoning and scientific criticism that were rationally applied to critique doctrines, traditional and dogmatic lifestyles of the “ancient” socio-cultural and political institutions. The leading intellectual thinkers and philosophers of the Enlightenment were resolute change agents of whom Descartes, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Bacon and Smith, to name only a few, were classic. These men were giants who bravely walked in darkness in order to establish a legacy that became the light of the world that majestically institutionalized it for its salvation.

Key Words: enlightenment, perspectives, psychological and moral values

Introduction

Enlightenment is a Social Science concept designed to break down barriers between social science disciplines, as well as making social scientific language comprehensible to general readers. The social science readers study anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, human geography, cultural studies and the sub-extensions of these disciplines. Also, Every major world civilization has its own definition of the term Enlightenment .The global synonyms of enlightenment are insight, understanding, awareness, wisdom, education, learning, knowledge, awakening, instruction, teaching, sophistication, advancement, development, open mindedness, broadmindedness, culture, refinement and cultivation. For instance, in Buddhism, Enlightenment means the attainment of spiritual knowledge or insight and awareness that frees a person from the cycle of rebirth .This is why Buddha’s disciples got protection in and from him. In the European intellectual and cultural tradition, the development of the 17th and 18th century enlightenment thought was largely an intellectual, philosophical, cultural, & rational movement that placed emphasis on reason, science and egalitarian individualism .The leading intellectual philosophers of this movement were Locke, Descartes and Newton .Also, its great men of learning placed emphasis on reason, logic, and freedom of thought as opposed to traditional dogma (belief) or freedom and enlightenment faith. Because of their ability to philosophize logically, scientifically and rationally, these men rejected ecclesiastical and temporal absolutism that were dominant in classical, medieval and scholastic periods. In China, Africa and Arabia, it means different things that are suitable for comparative analysis that is rooted in interpretive cultural dynamics.

The Enlightenment Philosophers were the new scientific Scholars who believed that rationality, empirical or experimental observation and analysis of human life and its social institutions could reveal truth about society, individuals and our universe. Subsequently, these enlightenment philosophers tried to expound their world views about social reality. The comparative result of their investigation was the invention, discovery and evolutionary development of the social scientific disciplines used to study society and the human condition by elevating it from the primitive to the more modern and civilized stages of all aspects of its development. However, there were two common themes in the Enlightenment era.

First, there was a general turning away from the dominance of organized religion, especially the Catholic Church, with less emphasis on literal interpretations of the Bible. Second, there was the emergence of a secular public culture that changed the absolute authority of the traditional church and state leaders. In other words, both religious and temporal institutions were scrutinized, criticized, and opened up for living or relearning and secularization.

The British Enlightenment

There is no general consensus on the definitive starting or ending point for the British Enlightenment, but many historians have argued that the seventeenth-century struggles for political power in England had a profound impact on the leading philosophers of the British Enlightenment. In 1649, there was a power struggle known as the English Civil War, which resulted in the execution of King Charles I, and the establishment of a commonwealth under the dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell. This military takeover was the first experiment with republicanism which lasted only ten years, and then the monarchy was restored under King Charles II. However, when Charles the second ascended the throne, Parliament placed limits on the absolute power of the reestablished monarchy. Unfortunately, the Stuart monarchy did not abide by these parliamentary restrictions on what society saw as radical absolutism. With a nonviolent coup d'état known as the **Glorious Revolution of 1688**, the English people once again overthrew the Stuart monarchy and essentially chose their next rulers. The marriage of Mary and William of Orange (Dutch) happened. William of Orange took the throne, Both agreed to the limitations imposed by Parliament on their powers. This effectively ended the idea of 'divine right to rule' (the concept that rulers derive their right to rule directly from God and are accountable only to God), came to an end in England forever. The English Bill of Rights was drawn up in 1689. The Bill of Rights increased parliamentary power and insured individual liberties. In essence, the struggle for power between the monarchy and parliament (the people) was in one way or the other, competition between monarchical/traditional ideas and intellectual/enlightenment ones.

Thomas Hobbes

Many scholars maintain that the first major figure in the British Enlightenment was the political philosopher **Thomas Hobbes** (1588-1679). Hobbes is best known for the *Leviathan* (1651), a lengthy work that explores the nature of man and justifies absolutist rule by the ruler. Hobbes argued that human nature was inherently bad and that humans would remain in a constant state for war, vying for power and material resources; unless kept in check by an absolute ruler, the Leviathan. He was of the opinion that human life is, by nature 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short'. He was on the pessimistic side of the Enlightenment and saw progress as the result of the suppression of man's instincts rather than the freedom granted to those instincts as the more optimistic British Enlightenment thinkers claimed. In terms of the theory of government, Hobbes contented that whenever people assume high political office, they will be inclined to abuse their positions. Therefore, Hobbes believed that a single absolute ruler is better than an oligarchy (a small group of people having control over a country) or democracy because the absolute sovereign's main duty is to provide stability for the society and if he fails at that task, people will replace the ruler with another. Since, people-civil society is formed out of fear, people submit to a strong monarch for protection from chaos and "war against all". On the other hand subjects remain loyal to the King by paying taxes, militarily fighting to protect the empire and avoiding revolution. This is the notion of social contract theory which provided for conservative, authoritarian, and stable political systems. Like Plato and Machiavelli, Hobbes is an individualistic realist who cares less about religion and its morals.

John Locke

Locke was diametrically opposed to the pessimism of Hobbes. John Locke lived between (1632-1704). In his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), Locke presents his idea that man's mind is a tabula rasa (blank slate) and that all humans can improve through conscious effort. In Locke's best-known work, *Two Treatises of Government* (1690) – he builds on his optimistic belief that every man is inherently good. People have natural rights among which are the inalienable rights to life, liberty and property. Although the tabula rasa Lockean idea has been scientifically refuted, the Popperian consciousness with which such refutation has developed contributes to the advancement of knowledge. This form of enlightenment placed emphasis on using reason and science rather than tradition and dogma in order to progress. The same Age of Reason attained the confluence of ideas and activities that shaped people's lives in the 18th century Western Europe, England, and the American Colonies. Inherent in these ideas was the spirit of scientific rationalism that was exemplified through the employment of Baconian scientific method and Newtonian physics during the Renaissance, Reformation, and the industrial revolution.

During the same age, Enlightenment thinkers believed that the advances of science and industry had produced a new age of egalitarianism and progress for humanity. More and more of goods were produced for less money, traveling increased, upward mobility changed their perceptions and status in society. The condition of their life improved significantly although elements of pessimistic criticism of the changes in question became rampant. The results of the period included but were not limited to urbanization, marketization, democratization, and literacy. Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* (1689) assert that civil society is formed for the protection of property. Life in the state of nature is peaceful but property rights were uncertain. For the rights to be observed and kept by the monarch, government required the consent of the governed. Evidently, Locke is an empirical liberal who promoted liberty, and like Montesquieu, limited government, rule of law, separation of powers which prevents abuses of power. For Locke, the commonwealth is a mutual social contract while the contract is one sided with Hobbes.

The American Enlightenment

The American enlightenment is a tradition in political thought imported to revolutionary America particularly by Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Paine. Jefferson drew on both the French and the Scottish Enlightenment; Paine especially on French Enlightenment and revolutionary thought. However, they did more than simply import Enlightenment ideas and European views to America; they modified and applied them. In the Declaration of Independence, which is based on a draft by Jefferson, in the Constitution, drawn up under Franklin's chairmanship, and in the Bill Of Rights, which was due among others to Jefferson (who had promulgated the Virginia Declaration of Religious Freedom on which the First Amendment was modeled) and James Madison's, American Enlightenment thought went beyond its teachers to produce documents that survive to this day. Jefferson also played a major role in re-exporting Enlightenment ideas to the France. The French Declaration of the Rights of Man and citizen of 1789, still incorporated in the modern French constitution (see also constitution), is in part an American statement of rights and in part a Rousseauvian statement of citizenship. In the early–nineteenth-century United States, there was a reaction against the secular tone of Enlightenment thought. Jefferson had been a religious agnostic, although one with a very high opinion of Jesus as an ethnical teacher, and Paine an antichristian deist. In the religious reaction that followed, Paine died in poverty and obscurity while Jefferson, in his last years retreated to 'the consolations of a sound philosophy equally indifferent to hope and fear' for the divine.

The American Enlightenment was a period of intellectual ferment in the thirteen American colonies/states in the period 1714-1818, which led to the American Revolution, and the creation of the American Republic. Influenced by the 18th- century European Enlightenment ideas, and its own native American philosophy, the American Enlightenment applied scientific reasoning to politics, science, and religion, promoted religious tolerance, and restored literature, the arts, and music as important disciplines and professions worthy of study in colleges. The "new-model" American style colleges of King's College in New York (now Columbia University), and the College of Philadelphia (now Pennsylvania State University) were founded, Yale College and the College of William & Mary were formed, and non-denominational moral philosophy replaced theology in many college curricula; even Puritan colleges such as the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University) and Harvard University reformed their curricula to include natural philosophy (science), modern astronomy, and mathematics. The foremost representatives of the American Enlightenment included men who were presidents of colleges particularly the Puritan religious leaders such as Jonathan Edwards, Thomas Clap, Ezra Stiles and Anglican moral philosophers like Samuel Johnson and William Smith. The leading Enlightenment political thinkers were John Adams, James Madison, George Mason, James Wilson, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. Leading scientists, included Benjamin Franklin for his work on electricity and William Smith for his organization and observations of the Transit of Venus, Jared Eliot for his work in metallurgy and agriculture, the astronomer David Rittenhouse in astronomy, math and instruments, Benjamin Rush in medical science, Charles Willson Peale in natural history, and Cadwallader Colden for his work in botany and town sanitation. Colden's daughter Jane Colden was the first botanist working in America.

Between 1714 and 1818 a great intellectual change took place that changed the British Colonies in America from a distant backwater into a leader in the fields of moral philosophy, educational reform, religious revival, industrial technology, science, and, most notably, political philosophy. It saw a consensus on the "pursuit of happiness" based political philosophy.

After 1780, the Federal-style of American Architecture began to diverge from the Georgian style and became a uniquely American genre; in 1813, the American architect Ithiel Town designed and in 1814-1816 build the first Gothic Style church in North America, Trinity Church on the Green in New Haven, predating the English Gothic revival by a decade.

Politically, the age is distinguished by an emphasis upon economic liberty, republicanism and religious tolerance, as clearly expressed in the United States Declaration of Independence. Attempts to reconcile science and religion resulted in a rejection of prophecy, miracles, and religion, resulting in an inclination toward deism among some major political leaders of the age. American republicanism emphasized consent of the government, riddance of aristocracy, and fear of corruption. It represented the convergence of classical republicanism and English republicanism (of 17th century Commonwealth men and 18th century English County Whigs). J.G.A. Pocock explained the intellectual sources of the enlightenment in America:

“The Whig canon and the neo-Harringtonians, John Milton, James Harrington and Sidney, Trenchard, Gordon and Bolingbroke, together with the Greek, Roman, and Renaissance masters of the tradition as far as Montesquieu, formed the authoritative literature of this culture; and its values and concepts were those with which we have grown familiar: a civic and patriot ideal in which the personality was founded in property, perfected in citizenship but perpetually threatened by corruption; government figuring paradoxically as the principal source of corruption and operating through such means as patronage, faction, standing armies (opposed to the ideal of the militia); established churches (opposed to the Puritan and deist models of American religion); and the promotion of a moneyed interest- through the formula of this last concept was somewhat hindered by the keen desire for readily available paper credit common in colonies of settlement.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Enlightenment

Since the 1960s, historians have debated the Enlightenment’s role in the American Revolution. Before 1960, the consensus was that liberalism, especially that of John Locke, was paramount; republicanism was largely ignored. The new interpretations were pioneered by J.G.A. Pocock who argued in *The Machiavellian Movement* (1975) that, at least in the early eighteenth-century, republican ideas were just as important as liberal ones. Pocock’s views are now widely accepted. Bernard Bailyn and Gordon Wood pioneered the argument that the Founding Fathers of United States were more influenced by republicanism than they were by liberalism. Cornell University Professor Isaac Kramnick, on the other hand, argues that Americans have always been highly individualistic and therefore Lockean. In the decades before the American Revolution (1776), the intellectual and political leaders of the colonies studied history intently, looking for guides or models for good (and bad) government. They especially followed the development of republican ideas in England. Pocock explained the rationale for their intellectual sources in the United States.

The Whig canon and the neo-Harringtonians, John Milton, James Harrington and Sidney, Trenchard, Gordon and Bolingbroke, together with the Greek, Roman, and Renaissance masters of this tradition which went as far as Montesquieu, formed the authoritative literature of this culture; and its values and concepts were those with which we have grown familiar: a civic and patriot ideal in which their personality was founded in property, perfected in citizenship but perpetually threatened by corruption; government featuring paradoxically as the principal source of corruption and operating through such means as patronage, faction, standing armies (opposed to the ideal of militia), established churches (opposed to the Puritan and deist models of American religion) and the promotion of a moneyed interest. Though the formulation of the concept was somewhat hindered by the keen desire for readily available paper credit common in colonies of settlement. A neoclassical political climate provided both the ethos of the elites and the rhetoric of the upwardly mobile, and accounts for the singular cultural and intellectual homogeneity of the Founding Fathers and their generation

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Enlightenment.

Leopold von Ranke, a leading German historian, in 1848 claimed that American republicanism played a crucial role in the development of Europe liberalism:

By abandoning English constitutionalism and creating a new republic based on the rights of the individual, the North Americans introduced a new force in the world. Ideas spread most rapidly when they have found adequate concrete expression. Thus republicanism entered our Romanic/Germanic world.... Up to this point, the conviction had prevailed in Europe that monarchy best served the interests of the nation. Now the idea spread that the nation should govern itself.

But only after a state had actually been formed on the basis of the theory of representation did the full significance of this idea become clear. All later revolutionary movements have the same goal.... This was the complete reversal of a principle. Until then, a king who ruled by the grace of God had been the center around which everything turned. Now the idea emerged that power should come from below.... These two principles are like two opposite poles, and it is the conflict between them that determines the course of the modern world. In Europe the conflict between them had not yet taken on concrete form; with the French Revolution it did.

Many historians find that the origin of this famous phrase derives from Locke's position that "no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions." Others suggest that Jefferson took the phrase from Sir Williams Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*. Others note that William Wollstone's 1722 book, *The Religion of Nature Delineated* describes the "trust definition" of "natural religion" as being "*The pursuit of happiness by the practice of reason and truth.*"

The Virginia Declaration of Rights, which was written by George Mason and adopted by the Virginia Convention of Delegates on June 12, 1776 a few days before Jefferson's draft, in part reads:

That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which when they enter to a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and perusing and obtaining happiness and safety. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Enlightenment)

Both the Moderate Enlightenment and a Radical or Revolutionary Enlightenment were reactions against the authoritarianism, irrationality, and obscurantism of the established churches. Philosophers, such as Voltaire depicted organized Christianity as a tool of tyrants and oppressors and as being used to defend monarchism. it was seen as hostile to the development of reason and the progress of science and incapable of verification.

An alternative religion was deism, the philosophical belief in a deity based on reason, rather than religious revelation or dogma. It was popular perception among the *philosophers*, who adopted deistic attitudes to varying degrees. Deism greatly influenced the thought of intellectuals and Founding Fathers, including John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, perhaps George Washington and, especially, Thomas Jefferson. The most articulate exponent was Thomas Paine, whose *The Age of Reason* was written in France in the early 1790s, and soon reached the United States. Paine was highly controversial; when Jefferson was attacked for his deism in the 1800 election, Republican politicians of the Federalist strand took pains to distance their candidate from Paine's intellectual radicalism that appeared to critique Jefferson's liberalism. Nobody escapes the skepticism or criticism of their ideas in reality.

The French Enlightenment

This is the name given to the French version of the most important movement of ideas during the eighteenth century .Other versions appeared mainly in England, Scotland, and the United States, and there were individual thinkers who were accepted as members from all over Europe. Although there were some differences between them, the Enlightenment was self-consciously international, and more particularly a European movement. Europe was often seen as single country divided into various provinces, but with a common way of thinking, a common set of values and a common language, Latin. French, had the same role as Latin in the Middle Ages. Belief in progress was universal among the thinkers of the Enlightenment, but it was not something that would appear by itself; philosophers knew that it had to appear by itself: they knew that they had to work for it .The word is civilization. With its modern signification and values, was probably first used by Mirabeau (father of the French revolution) and prominent figure in 1757. Attempts to provide exact dates for the beginning or the end of the enlightenment are little more than an imposed neatness. Overall, the origins of all Enlightenment thought can be found in the works of seventeenth-century thinkers such as Hobbes , Descartes, Locke, and Newton, who were far more then original than their later followers, and who provided them with basic assumptions and methods in epistemology ,psychology, natural science, and the study of society. After the Glorious Revolution of 1688, which provided new models for political changes as mentioned earlier, the thought of its liberal supporters became the starting point for discussion in Europe in the early part of the eighteenth century. In the middle of the century came an explosion of ideas with Montesquieu's *Esprit de Lois* (1748), the first volumes of the *Encyclopedie* (1751), the start of Buffon's *Histoire naturelle* (1749) and even if they belonged to a different style of thought. *Rousseau's two Discourses* (1750 and 1754) empowered the movement's ideas.

Thinkers of the French Enlightenment were by no means agreed in many areas but they all rejected authority as the basis for knowledge. Instead, they accepted the rationalism developed in the previous centuries, whether in its deductive or empirical form. This did not automatically imply a rejected authority as the basis for knowledge. Instead they accented the rationalism developed in the previous century. Whether in its deductive or empirical form. This did not automatically imply a rejection of religion, and various forms of Protestantism, and even Catholicism. In practice, however it meant rejecting the Church as the source of knowledge and therefore of the rules by which anyone should live. These could only be reached by the individual exercising his reason. The best example of this attitude was the *Encyclopedia*, edited by Diderot and d'Alembert which is claimed to present all existing knowledge in an easily assailable and usable form. This approach applied every subject and includes not only human nature, religion and politics but also natural sciences, laws and the arts, as well as strict practical subject's. Philosophy in a strict sense, especially ontology, suffered a decline. In other words, the invention of the social sciences may have helped to lessen the power and influence which the former possessed.

Given this common starting point, the French Enlightenment starting politically divided between those such as Voltaire who favored strengthening the absolute monarchy as the most efficient way to achieve reform, and those such as Montesquieu who favored restricting the monarchy to re-establish liberty. Various other positions existed, such as those of Helvetius and the adherence of various absolute monarchs and other rulers in Europe, such as Frederick II of Prussia, Joseph of Austria and Catherine II of Russia demonstrates the point Rousseau is sometimes making. Rousseau is sometimes seen as a member of the French Enlightenment –he was for a time accepted by some of its other members and contributed to the *Encyclopedia* –but his pessimism and the fact that his most significant political proposals seem to have concerned only what could be done in a city-state made his argument doubtful. However, regardless of his doubt, his *Social Contract* (1762) affirms that civil society ensures freedom. At that time people lived as “noble savages” who were latter corrupted by the society. He concluded that the philosophy of the “general will” and the individualized personalization of the principle of general monarchy could protect and ennoble every person.

Rousseau favors civilization as he powerfully and beautifully romanticizes the goodness of humanity. He like Plato, is a realist. He is not a liberal like Locke. He is not individualistic either but he supports the general will. People in nature are noble savages whom, as inferred to earlier, society corrupts. Rousseau influenced Immanuel Kant's thinking. Noble savages are provoked and irritated by feelings, emotions, and problems rather than by rationality. His goal was to come back from nature to humanity. Voltaire attacked and was critical to humanity. The social contract theorists are Locke, Hobbes and Rousseau. As a humanist, he criticized modern society for the corruption of its destructive values and weakening of social institutions. He asserted that the basis of his desire for human needs was self-preservation. He valued and elevated political and social equality rather than the inequality of both. In nature, men were “born free but are everywhere in chains”. To free themselves from tyranny and oppression, men needed to employ the “general will” as “a social contract” for protection against destructive ambition and selfishness. This approach would enable them to protect their preservation. He advocated for good laws that promoted a middle-class society in which the wealthy rather than the poor paid taxes.

The Scottish Enlightenment

The period from about 1730 to about 1800 was one of the brightest in the history of the Scottish universities (and one of the dimmest in the history of the English ones). Why this was so has never been established; it may perhaps be attributed to an influx of wealth and self confidence following the Treaty of Union in 1707 and coupled with the lack of clerical control over the universities. The main figures of the Scottish Enlightenment were Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746), and Adam Ferguson, (1753-1816), David Hume, Adam Smith, and Dug lad Stewart (1753-1828). The second reason may be attributed to the fact that major English Universities were dominated by conservative religious ideology, dogmatic and unscientific intellectual traditions. It is difficult to generalize about the thought of a loosely connected group of people, but the Scottish Enlightenment tried to construct first principles of politics and society free from the religious underpinnings that had previously been thought essential even by liberals such as Locke, based on laissez-faire theory. Hume and Smith developed classical economics. The Scottish Enlightenment had reciprocal links with the France and America. Hume spent several years in France, Where he wrote his *Treatise of Human Nature* while Smith and Turgot admired each other's works. Jefferson owed much to Scottish teachers at William and Mary College, and much of mainstream liberal thought may have reached America through such routes. Although the Declaration of Independence sounds very Lockean, it reflects what Locke inherited through the Scottish Enlightenment (and thus secularized) rather than directly popularizing it.

Social Sciences- Enlightenment Thinkers

Social science is the ambitious concept that defines the set of disciplines of scholarship which deal with the aspects of human society. The singular implies a community or method and approach which deal with what is now claimed by few; thus the plural, social sciences, seems more appropriate. The social sciences include economics, sociology (and anthropology) and political science. At their boundaries, the social sciences reach into the study of the individual (social psychology) and of nature (social biology, social geography). Methodologically, they straddle normative (law, social philosophy, political theory) and historical approaches (social history, economic history). In terms of university departments, the social sciences have split up into numerous areas of teaching and research, including not only the central disciplines, but also such subjects as industrial relations, international relations, business studies and social (public) administration.

The term social science(s) does not sit easily in the universe of scholarship, especially in English. *Sciences sociales* and *Sozialwissenschaften* are somewhat happier expressions, though they too have suffered from being interpreted either too widely or too narrowly. Frequently, social science is meant to define either sociology, or synthetic social theory only. Everywhere, the implied analogy to the natural sciences has been contested. In 1982, the British government challenged the name of the publicly financed Social Science Research Council arguing *inter alia* that 'social studies' would be a more appropriate description for disciplines of scholarship which cannot just claim to be scientific. (The council is now called Economic and Social Research Council.)

The history of the concept does not help much in trying to make sense of it. Social sciences have grown out of moral philosophy (as the natural sciences emerged from natural philosophy). It has often been observed that their separate identity owes much to the great revolutions of the eighteenth century, the Industrial (English) and the bourgeois (French) Revolutions. Among the Scottish moral philosophers of that time, the study of political economy was always coupled with that of wider social issues (though not called social science). With Auguste Comte (1830-42; 1844), who placed emphasis on the factual as against the vague, the positive as against the negative or critical. It is thus both science in the sense of nineteenth-century materialism and prescription. Comte borrowed the term, science social, from Charles Fourier (1808) to describe the supreme synthetic discipline of the edifice of science. At the same time, he had no doubt the method of social science (which he also called social physics) was in no way different from that of the natural sciences.

Five developments either stemming from Comte, or encouraged by different traditions, have helped to confuse the methodological picture of the social sciences.

First, many of those who took the analogy to the natural sciences seriously engaged in social research. The great factual surveys of Charles Booth in Britain, and of the Chicago School in the USA, bear witness to this trend. Frederic Le Play had started a similar tradition in France. In Germany, the *Verein für Socialpolitik* adopted the same research techniques. Such often large-scale descriptive enterprises are the precursors of modern ('empirical') social research and analysis.

Second, science, of course, is more than fact-finding. Thus a natural science notion of theoretical social science has informed at least two of the heroes of sociology, Emile Durkheim (1895) and Vilfredo Pareto need to study 'social facts', whereas Pareto stimulated both meta-theoretical insight and specific theories. They have had few followers.

Third, by the turn of the century, a methodological dichotomy was born which gave rise to another aspect, or notion, of social science. Against the ambitions of those who tried to emulate the natural sciences in the study of social phenomena, the German School of thought gained ground, according to which social analysis, but require a different approach, one of *Verstehen*, of empathy and understanding. Max Weber (1921) straddled different approaches, but introduced into social science what were later called 'hermeneutic' or 'phenomenological' perspectives that enrich scholarly interpretations.

Fourth, it will readily be seen that all three approaches mentioned so far are most closely associated with the subject of sociology and its history. Indeed. Economics soon began to go its own way. Ever since the decline of the German historical ('romantic') school of economists, it developed at the discipline which of all the social sciences most nearly deserves the name, science. Economic knowledge is to a considerable extent cumulative; theories are developed and tested, if not always against reality; then at least against models and their assumptions. *Verstehende* economics, even descriptive economics, have become the exception.

Finally, Max Weber also insisted on another distinction which defines the fifth aspect of social science, that between knowledge, however gained and valued, prescription and description (of theory) belongs to different universes of discourse. The distinction was explosive at the time (*Werturteilsstreit*), and continues to be that, although political theory, moral philosophy, and jurisprudence have gone their own ways, and the study of social policy has shifted from the prescriptive to the analytical arena.

These then are the disparate methodological elements of social science: empirical social science, descriptive in character if not in intention, increasingly sophisticated in its techniques which are themselves manifold; rare attempt at developing theories in the strict sense, attempts which are neither universal analysis of the present, often full of empirical data as well as attempts at explanation, the bulk of social science; economics; and explicitly prescriptive social theory, often political in substance and intent.

Looking at the social science as a whole, this is quite a pell-mell, and is perceived as such. However, all attempts to produce a new synthesis have failed. The most ambitious examples are those by Karl Popper (1945; 1959[1934]) and Talcott Parsons (1937; 1951; 1956). Popper insists that there is one logic of scientific inquiry. It is the logic of progress by falsification: we advance hypotheses (theories), and progress by refuting accepted hypotheses through research, that is conducted by trial and error tactics. Popper did not primarily have the social science in mind, but it is here that his language has created havoc. Everybody now 'hypothesizes', though few such projects are even capable of falsification. More importantly, Popper's logic, if misinterpreted as practical advice to scholars, leads to an arid notion of scholarly activity, especially in the social sciences. If hypothetico-deductive progress is all there is then 99 per cent of all social science is useless. Of course it is not. Popper's logic of scientific enquiry provides but one measure of advancement; it is not a litmus test for distinguishing between what is and what is not social science. Indeed, Popper himself has written important works of social science, or at any rate social-philosophical, analysis.

Talcott Parsons' attempted synthesis on systems theory is even more ambitious in that it is addressed to the theoretical substance of social science. Throughout his numerous abstract analyses, Parsons has argued that the substance of social science is one, social action, and that even the incarnations of social action stem from the same general model, the social system. According to Parsons, the social system has four subsystems: the economy, the policy, the cultural system and the 'integrative' systems. Economics, political science, the study of culture and that of social integration (sociology) are thus related, and interdependent, disciplines. Descending from the social system, all subsystems require similar analysis. Parson's claims have had little effect on social sciences other than sociology. Economists in particular have largely ignored them. Their central weakness may be that while society can be looked at in this way, it need not be. In any case, different social sciences have continued to go their own way. Have they progressed? It would be vain to deny this, though concepts of progress differ with different methods. At the same time, the social sciences have probably given us *multa non multum*. Perhaps, a more modest approach is indicated today. In the absence of a synthesis, it is desirable to let a hundred flowers bloom. Each of the social sciences will continue to contribute to knowledge. It is not unlikely the important developments will occur at the boundaries of different disciplines. It is also probable that most social sciences will incorporate several of the approaches which have splits of other subjects. Though the search for synthesis will never cease, in fact the social sciences will for some time remain a variegated and somewhat disparate group of intellectual endeavours.

The main social sciences include economics, political science, human geography, demography and sociology. In a wider sense, social science also includes some fields in the humanities such as anthropology, archaeology, psychology, history, law and linguistics. The term is also sometimes used to refer specifically to the field of sociology, the original 'science of society', established in the 19th century.

Around the start of the 20th century, Enlightenment philosophy was challenged in various quarters. After the use of classical theories and since the end of the scientific revolution, various fields substituted mathematics studies for experimental studies and examined to build a theoretical structure. The development of social science subfields became very quantitative in methodology. The interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary nature of scientific inquiry into human behavior, social and environmental factors affecting it, made many of the natural sciences interested in some aspects of social science methodology. Examples of boundary blurring include emerging disciplines like social research of medicine, sociobiology, neuropsychology, bioeconomics and the history and sociology of science. Increasingly, quantitative research and qualitative methods are being integrated in the study of human action and its implications and consequences.

In the first half of the 20th century, statistics became a free-standing discipline of applied mathematics. Statistical methods were used confidently.

The term “social science” may refer either to the specific *sciences of society* established by thinkers such as Comte, Durkheim, Marx, and Weber, or more generally to all the disciplines outside of “noble science” and arts. By the late 19th century, the academic social sciences were constituted of five fields: jurisprudence and amendment of the law, education, health, economy and trade, and art. Around the start of the 21st century, the expanding domain of economics in the social studies has been described as economic imperialism.

Anthropology is the holistic “science of man”, a science of the human existence. The discipline deals with the integration of different aspects of the social sciences, humanities, and human biology. In the twentieth century, academic disciplines have often been institutionally divided into three broad domains. The natural *sciences* seek to derive general laws through reproducible and verifiable experiments. The *humanities* generally study local traditions, through their history, literature, music, and arts, with an emphasis on understanding particular individuals, events or eras. The *social sciences* have generally attempted to develop scientific methods for understanding social phenomena on a generalized way, through, usually with methods distinct from those of the natural sciences.

Within the United States, anthropology is divided into four subfields: archeology, physical or biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology. It is an area that is offered at most undergraduate institutions. The word *anthropos* is from the Greek for “human being” or “person.” Eric Wolf described socio-cultural anthropology as “the most scientific of the humanities, and the most humanistic of the sciences.”

The goal of anthropology is to provide a holistic account of humans and human nature. This means that, though anthropologists generally specialize in only one sub-field, they always keep in mind biological, linguistic, historic and cultural aspects of any problem. Since anthropology arose as a science in Western societies that were complex and industrial, a major trend within anthropology has been methodological drive to study peoples in societies with more simple social organization, sometimes called “primitive” in anthropological literature, but without any connotation of “inferior.” Today, anthropologists use a term such as “less complex” societies or refer to specific modes of subsistence or production as a “pastoralist” or “forager” or “horticulturalist” to refer to humans living in nonindustrial, non-Western cultures. Such people or folk (*ethnos*) continue to remain of great interest within the discipline of anthropology.

The quest for holism leads most anthropologists to study a people in detail, using biogenetic, archaeological, and linguistic data alongside direct observation of contemporary customs. In the 1990s and 2000s, calls for clarification of what constitutes a culture, of how an observer knows where his or her own culture ends and another begins, and other crucial topics in writing anthropology were heard. It is possible to view all human cultures as part of one large, evolving global culture. These dynamic relationships, between what can be observed on the ground, as opposed to what can be observed by compiling many local observations, remain fundamental to any kind of anthropology, whether cultural, biological, linguistic or archaeological.

Political science is an academic and research discipline that deals with the theory and practice of politics and the description and analysis of political behavior. Fields and subfields of political science include political economy, political theory and philosophy, civics and comparative politics, theory of direct democracy, political governance, participatory direct democracy, national systems, cross- national political analysis, political development, international relations, foreign policy, international law, politics, public administrative behavior, public law, judicial behavior and public policy. Political science also studies power on the basis of international relations and the theory of great powers and superpowers.

Political science is methodologically diverse, although recent years have witnessed an upsurge in the use of the scientific method, that is, the proliferation of formal- deductive model building and quantitative hypothesis testing. Approaches to the discipline include rational choice, classical political philosophy, interpretivism, structuralism, and behaviorism, realism, pluralism, and institutionalism. Political science, as one of the social sciences, uses methods and techniques that relate to the kinds of inquiries sought: primary sources such as historical documents, interviews, and official records, as well as secondary sources such as scholarly articles are used in building and testing theories. Empirical methods include survey research, statistical analysis or econometrics, case studies, experiments, and model building. Herbert Baxter Adams is credited with coining the phrase “political science” while teaching history at Johns Hopkins University.

Social theory is a collective variety of social science research methods and theories in use. Other social scientists emphasize the subjective as opposed to objective nature of research. These writers share social theory perspectives that include various types particularly the following:

- Critical theory is the examination and critique of society and culture, drawing from knowledge across social sciences and humanities disciplines.
- Dialectical (historical) materialism is the philosophy of Karl Marx, which he formulated by taking the dialectic of Hegel and joining it to the materialism of Feuerbach.
- Feminist theory is the extension of feminism into theoretical, or philosophical discourse; it aims to understand the nature of gender inequality. Inequality is both natural and morally constructed.

Marxist theories, such as revolutionary theory and class theory, cover work in philosophy that is strongly influenced by Karl Marx's historical materialist approach to theory and is written by Marxists.

- Phronetic social sciences is a theory and methodology for studying social science by focusing on ethics and political power, based on a contemporary interpretation of Aristotelian phronesis.
- Post-colonial theory is a reaction to the cultural legacy of colonialism.
- Postmodernism refers to a point of departure for works of literature, drama, architecture, cinema, and design, as well as in marketing and business and in the interpretation of history, law, culture and religion in the 20th century.
- Rational choice is a framework for understanding and often formally modeling social and economic behavior.
- Social constructionism considers how social phenomena develop in social contexts.
- Structuralism is an approach to the human sciences that attempt to analyze a specific field (for instance, mythology) as a complex system of interrelated parts.
- Structural functionalism is a sociological paradigm that addresses what functions various elements of the social system perform in regard to the entire system's stability.

Conclusion: Intellectual Legacy

German's Kant viewed the Enlightenment in terms of acquisition of "Knowledge as a form of liberation" that allows social groups and entities to value diversity. Although the geographic and intellectual center of the Enlightenment was in France, that of the Renaissance was in Italy while the one for the Reformation was in German. Kant interpreted the intellectual movement as a form of "emancipation from self-incurred tutelage." In other words, the vanguard of educated intellectuals of Europe had creatively internalized classical ideas to overthrow Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian styles of living and practice. The modern centers for the construction and publication of Enlightenment thought were Amsterdam, London and Switzerland.

The Enlightenment printed books meant for clandestine circulation in France and in Eastern Europe and Russia where Frederick the Great used the services of Voltaire while Catherine the Great of Russia employed those of Diderot and the Polish nobility accepted advice from Rousseau- hence "enlightened despotism."

The social history of these ideas made them to command a competitive consensus and divergence because the Enlightenment was not a single theoretical system or unitary ideological doctrine. Instead this intellectual movement produced a form of intellectual paganism (Gay, 1966) that promoted theism (natural religion) rejected miracles, denounced elements of divine intervention, the authenticity of the "holy" scripture and the divinity of Jesus Christ. The same enlightenment thinkers regarded traditional catholic and protestant churches to be sources of institutional exploitation and oppression. The enlightenment was mercilessly revolutionary.

According to Kant, this heroic age of scientific achievement was ontologically divided in terms of materialism, idealism, epistemological rationalism and empiricism. Above all, the natural rights tradition, as viewed by Grotius, Hobbes, Locke and Pufendorf popularized and disseminated the ideas of the Enlightenment through translations, summaries and intellectual commentary. They helped society to culturally and socio-politically institutionalize such values as "natural rights, state of nature, civil society, and social contract". These intellectuals helped to define the meaning of American and French "inalienable natural rights to life, liberty and property (pursuit of happiness) as written by Rousseau, Locke and interpreted by Jefferson. As the thinkers accepted programmatic accommodation with monarchy, the European state promoted proto-liberalism. Social scientists determined a 4 stage theory of the development of human civilization, i.e. hunter gatherer, nomadic, agricultural and commercial that is relatively different from the one discussed elsewhere.

The commercial stage articulated society's notions about political economy which Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) and Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-1788) tried to romanticize. Also, both imaginative literature in the form of poetry, fiction, and plays and varieties of classical music and that of the Enlightenment period were emblematic of the great Enlightenment spirit and its

cosmopolitanism.

The social history of the Enlightenment, as Jurgen Habermas' book *Der Strukturwandel Der Offentlichkeit* (1962), translated as the structural transformation of the *Public Sphere*, argues that Europe's socioeconomic development stimulated 18th century men to experience a revolution in reading and writing that was superior to the one of the 15th and 16th centuries print culture introduced by Johann Gutenberg in 1440.

This literary revolution was voluminous in literacy, printed matter, variety and careerism. The centers for the exchange of ideas were the female directed centers of expression- the salons, coffee houses and other centers of "sociability" where writers and intellectuals of Paris, London, Berlin and Vienna used and consumed intoxicants in taverns, wine shops, Masonic lodges, and coffee houses in order to promote and disseminate enlightenment ideas through secular and voluntary associations. Although this movement was largely masculine as opposed to feminine, its architects were the representatives of the aristocracy (Montesquieu and Condorcet), middle-class (Voltaire and Diderot) and the "Grub Street" journalists of the popular culture (Dainton, 1979).

Conclusion What is the intellectual legacy of the Enlightenment?

In brief and powerfully so, the enlightenment's massive and thoughtful professional literature exceeded that of scholasticism, the Renaissance, the Reformation and the scientific Revolution. The Enlightenment, as a movement has polemically and philosophically inspired revolutionary commentary in intellectual history so much so that it has validated the philosophies of humanism, liberalism and the American Constitution. On the contrary, the extreme and pessimistic results have encouraged 20th century fascism, Stalinism, consumer capitalism and lately the narcissistic, racist, fearful aspects of trumpism, sounds of nationalist, isolationist, transactional and other elements that are suspicious of the world.

Today, this field remains divided between contemporary representatives of these positions. The descendants of Becker, Horkheimer, Adorno, and Foucault can be found among the major theorists of postmodernism, who continue to attack the Enlightenment both for its utopianism, its supposed addiction to "grand narratives" of progress and emancipation that is associated with intellectual authoritarianism, embodied in its various philosophical "essentialisms" or "foundationalisms". If successors to Cassirer and Gay are somewhat less vocal today, it is perhaps precisely because the Enlightenment might not seem to require such strenuous advocacy, in a world dominated by a triumphant neo-liberalism that claims direct descent from it. The contemporary politics of the enlightenment remain unpredictable, however. Paradoxically, by far, the most visible promoter of its values today is in fact the most famous living representative of the "unfinished project" of the enlightenment. The note of modesty, acknowledging the gap between goal and accomplishment, in fact captures the self-definition of the Enlightenment far better than any kind of self-congratulation. It was Kant himself who answered the question, "Do we now live in enlightened age?" by saying: "No, but we live in an age of enlightened" –a judgment that perhaps remains as true today as when it was first rendered.

A right-wing nationalist ideology or movement with a totalitarian and hierarchical structure that is fundamentally opposed to democracy and liberalism; the term originated in ancient Rome, where the authority of the state was symbolized by the fasces, a bundle of rods bound together (signifying popular unity) with a protruding axe-head (denoting leadership). As such, it was appropriated by Mussolini to label the movement he led to power in Italy in 1922, but was subsequently generalized to cover a whole range of movements in Europe during the interwar period. These include the National Socialists in Germany, as well as others such as Action Francaise, the Arrow Cross in Hungary, or the Falangists in Spain.

A classification of genuinely fascist ideologies might proceed as follows. With regard to structures, such ideologies are: monistic, that is to say, based upon the notion that there are fundamental and basic truths about humanity and environment which do not admit to question: simplistic, in the sense of ascribing complex phenomena to single causes by advancing single remedies; fundamentalist, that is, involving a division of the world into 'good' and 'bad' with nothing in between; and conspiratorial, that is, predicated on the existence of the secret world-wide conspiracy by hostile group(s) seeking to manipulate the masses to achieve and/or maintain a dominant position.

In content, these ideologies are distinguished by five components. (1) Extreme nationalism, the belief that there is a clearly defined nation which has its own distinctive characteristics, culture and interests, and which is superior to others. (2) This is usually coupled with an assertion of national decline- that at some point in the mythical past the nation was great, with harmonious social and political relationships, and dominant over others, and that subsequently it has disintegrated, become internally fractious and divided, and subordinate to lesser nations. (3) This process of national decline is often linked to a diminution of the racial purity of the nation. In some movements, the nation is regarded as co-extensive with the race (the national race), while others, hierarchies or races are defined generically with nations located within them (the race-nation); in virtually all cases, the view is taken that the introduction of impurities has weakened the nation and been responsible for its plight. (4) The blame for national decline and/or racial miscegenation is laid at the door of a conspiracy on the part of other nations/races seen as competing in a desperate struggle for dominance. (5) In that struggle, both capitalism and its political form, liberal democracy, are seen as mere diverse devices designed to fragment the nation and subordinate it further in the world order (McClean, 1996).

With regard to prescriptive content, the first priority is the reconstitution of the nation as an entity by restoring its purity. The second is to restore national dominance by reorganizing the polity, the economy, and society. Means to this end include variously: (1) institution of an authoritarian and anti-liberal state dominated by a single party; (2) total control by the latter over political aggregation, communication, and socialization; (3) direction by the state of labor and consumption to create a productionist and self-sufficient economy; and (4) a charismatic leader embodying the 'real' interests of the nation and energizing the masses. With these priorities fulfilled, the nation would then be in a position to recapture its dominance, if necessary by military means. Is this Trump's America? Such priorities were explicit in the interwar fascist movements, which indulged in racial/ethnic 'cleansing', established totalitarian political systems, productionist economies, and dictatorships, and of course went to war in pursuit of international dominance. But such parties can no longer openly espouse these extremes of the ideology, although revisions have taken place; national/racial purity now takes the form of opposition to continuing immigration and demands for repatriation. Totalitarianism and dictatorship have been replaced by lesser demands for significant strengthening in the authority of the state, allegedly within a democratic framework; productionism has become interventionism; and military glory has been largely eschewed. Postwar movements with such ideologies are conventionally described as neofascist.

The Enlightenment has always been contested territory. Its supporters "hail it as the source of everything that is progressive about the modern world. For them, it stands for freedom of thought, rational inquiry, critical thinking, religious tolerance, political liberty, scientific achievement, the pursuit of happiness, and hope for failure." However, its detractors accuse it of 'shallow' rationalism, naïve optimism, unrealistic universalism, and moral darkness. From the start there was a Counter- Enlightenment in which conservative and clerical defenders of traditional religion attacked materialism and skepticism as evil forces that encouraged immorality. By 1794, it pointed to the Terror during the French Revolution as confirmation of their predictions. As the Enlightenment Age was ending, Romantic philosophers argued that excessive dependence on reason was a mistake perpetuated by the Enlightenment, because it disregarded the bonds of history, myth, faith and tradition that were necessary for holding the social fabric together. Overall, this comparative synthesis of the Enlightenment appears to have historically and intellectually evolved in the 17th century with overtones that speak to us in a new and modern but comparative and pessimistic way.

References

- Discour sur l'esprit positif (1844), in Paris. (English translation, *Discourse on the Positive Spirit*, 1903. London) Parsons, (1951). *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL.
- A Theory of Cognition Dissonance (1957). Evanston, IL.
- The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. (1935[1959]) New York. (Original edn, *Logik der Forschung*. Vienna.)
- Herman A. (2001). *How the Scots Invented the Modern World* (Crown Publishing Group, 2001).
- Allport, G. W. (1954) "The historical background of modern social psychology", in G.E. Lindzey (ed.) *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 1st edn, vol I, Cambridge, MA
- Asch, S. E. (1956) 'Studies of independence and conformity: a minority of one against a unanimous majority', *Psychology Monographs* 70.
- Baruch Spinoza, *Theologico-Political Treatise*, "Preface," 1677, gutenberg.com
- Becker, Carl L. *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers*. (1932), a famous short classic

- Bem, D.J. (1967) 'Self- perception: an alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena', *Psychological Review* 74.
- Brewer, Daniel. *The Enlightenment Past: reconstructing 18th-century French thought.* (2008).
- Broadie, Alexander. *The Cambridge Companion to the Scottish Enlightenment* (2003) excerpt and text search
- Bronner, Stephen. *Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement*, 2004
- Bronner, Stephen. *The Great Divide: The Enlightenment and its Critics* (1995)
- Comte, A. (1830-42) *Cours de philosophie positive*, Paris. (English translation, *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte*, London. 1896)
- D. Daiches, P. Jones and J. Jones, *A Hotbed of Genius: The Scottish Enlightenment, 1730–1790* (1986).
- Daniel Brewer, ed. (2014). *The Cambridge Companion to the French Enlightenment.* Cambridge UP. pp. 91ff.
- Daniel Roche, *France in the Enlightenment*, (1998), 420.
- Dena Goodman, *The Republic of Letters: A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment* (1994), 53.
- Donna T. Andrew, "Popular Culture and Public Debate: London 1780", *This Historical Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 2. (June 1996), pp. 405–423.
- Durkheim, E. (1895) *Les Regles de la method scientifique*, Paris. (English translation , *The Rules of Sociological Method*, Chicago, 1938)
- Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter, "Thoughts on the Enlightenment and Enlightenment in Russia", *Modern Russian History & Historiography*, 2009, Vol. 2 Issue 2, pp. 1–26
- Emma Spary, "The 'Nature' of Enlightenment" in *The Sciences in Enlightened Europe*, William Clark, Jan Golinski, and Steven Schaffer, eds. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 281–82.
- Eugen Weber, *Movements, Currents, Trends: Aspects of European Thought in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (1992)
- Festinger, L. (1954) 'A theory of social comparison process', *Human Relations* 7.
- Fiske, S. T. and Taylor, S.E (1991) *Social Cognition*, 2nd edn, New York.
- Fourier, C. (1808) *Theorie des quatre movement et des destinees generals*, Lyon.
- Harrison, Lawrence E. (2012). *Jews, Confucians, and Protestants: Cultural Capital and the End of Multiculturalism.* Rowman & Littlefield. p. 92.
- Hazard, Paul. *European thought in the 18th century: From Montesquieu to Lessing* (1965)
- Heider, F. (1958) *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*, New York.
- Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (1978)
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *The Roads to Modernity: The British, French, and American Enlightenments* (2004) excerpt and text search
- http://sageamericanhistory.net/colonies_empire/topics/enlighten.htm.
- http://www.csudh.edu/phenom_studies/western/lect_8.html.
- <http://www.encyclopedia.com/topc/Enlightenment.aspx>.
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_Enlightenment.
- Ingraffia, Brian D. (1995) *Postmodern theory and biblical theology: vanquishing God's shadow* p. 126
- Israel, Jonathan I. (2010). *A Revolution of the Mind: Radical Enlightenment and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Democracy.* Princeton.
- J. A. Leo Lemay (2013). *The Life of Benjamin Franklin, Volume 2: Printer and Publisher, 1730–1747.* University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 83–92.
- Jack Fruchtman, Jr., *Atlantic Cousins: Benjamin Franklin and His Visionary Friends* (2007)
- Jacob, Margaret *Enlightenment: A Brief History with Documents* 2000
- James E. McClellan III, "Learned Societies," in *Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment*, ed. Alan Charles Kors (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- <http://www.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/HistoryWorld/Modern/?view=usa&ci=9780195104301> (accessed on June 8, 2008).
- Kelley, H. H. (1967) 'Attribution theory in social psychology', *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* 14.
- Klein, Lawrence E. "Coffeehouse Civility, 1660–1714: An Aspect of Post-Courtly Culture in England." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 59.1 (1996): 30–51.

- Lewin, K. Lippitt, R. and White, R. K. (1939) 'Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates"', *Journal of Social Psychology* 10.
- Likert, R. 1932 'A technique for the measurement of attitudes', *Archive of Psychology* 140.
- Lindzey, G. E. and Aronson, E. (eds) (1985) *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 3rd edn, 2 vols, New York
- Locke, John (1695). "Reasonableness of Christianity".
- M. Fry, *Adam Smith's Legacy: His Place in the Development of Modern Economics* (Routledge, 1992).
- M. Magnusson (10 November 2003), "Review of James Buchan, *Capital of the Mind: how Edinburgh Changed the World*", *New Statesman*, archived from the original on 2011-05-29, retrieved 2014-04-27
- Margaret C. Jacob, "Polite worlds of Enlightenment," in Martin Fitzpatrick and Peter Jones, eds. *The Enlightenment World* (Routledge, 2004) pp. 272–87.
- Margaret C. Jacob, ed. *The Enlightenment: Brief History with Documents*, Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001, Introduction, pp. 1–72.
- Margaret C. Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and politics in eighteenth-century Europe* (Oxford University Press, 1991.)
- McDougall, W. (1908) *An Introduction to Social Psychology*, London.
- McLean, Iain (1996). (ed.) *The Census Oxford Dictionary of Politics*. New York. Oxford University Press
- Michael Atiyah, "Benjamin Franklin and the Edinburgh Enlightenment," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* (Dec 2006) 150#4 pp. 591–606.
- Milgram, S. (1974) *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*, New York.
- Munck, Thomas. *Enlightenment: A Comparative Social History, 1721–1794 England*. (1994)
- Nisbett, R. E. and Ross, L. (1980) *Human Inference: Strategies and Shortcoming of Social Judgment*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ
- Ole Peter Grell; Roy Porter (2000). *Toleration in Enlightenment Europe*. Cambridge University Press. pp. 1–68.
- Outram, Dorinda. *The Enlightenment* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 12.
- Pareto, V. *Trattato die sociologia generale*, Rome. (English translation, *The Mind and Society: Treatise General Sociology*, 4 vols, London, 1935.)
- Parsons, T. (1937) *The Structure of Social Action*, New York.
- Paul M. Spurlin, *Montesquieu in America, 1760–1801* (1941)
- Pierre Manent, *An Intellectual History of Liberalism* (1994) pp. 20–38
- Popper, K (1945) *The Open Society and its Enemies*, London.
- R. B. Bernstein (2003). *Thomas Jefferson*. Oxford University Press. p. 179.
- Richard Weisberger et al., eds., *Freemasonry on both sides of the Atlantic: essays concerning the craft in the British Isles, Europe, the United States, and Mexico* (2002)
- Robert Darnton, *The Business of Enlightenment: a publishing history of the Encyclopédie, 1775–1800* (2009).
- Robert R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution: The struggle* (1970) p. 53
- Roland Sarti, *Italy: A Reference Guide from the Renaissance to the Present*, Infobase Publishing, 2009, p. 457
- Ross, E. A. (1908) *Social Psychology: An Outline and A Source Book*, New York.
- Schneider, D. J. (1994) Attribution and social cognition', in A. M. Colman (ed.) *Companion Encyclopedia of Psychology*, vol. 2, London.
- Theodor W. Adorno; Max Horkheimer (1947). "The Concept of Enlightenment". In G. S. Noerr. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Translated by E. Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press. p. 3.
- Thibaut, J. W. and Kelley H.H (1959) *The Social Psychology of Groups*, New York.
- Thomas Paine, *Of the Religion of Deism Compared with the Christian Religion, 1804*, *Internet History Sourcebook*
- Thurstone, L. L. and Chave, E. J. (1929) *The Measurement of Attitude*, Chicago, IL.
- Warman, Caroline; et al. (2016), *Tolerance: The Beacon of the Enlightenment*, ISBN 9781783742035
- Weber, M. (1921), *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, Tubingen. (English translation, *Economy and Society*, New York, 1968.)
- Zafirovski, Milan (2010), *The Enlightenment and Its Effects on Modern Society*, p. 144
- Zanna, M. P. (ed.) (1990, 1991, 1992, 1994) *Advance in Experimental Social Psychology*, vols 23-6, San Diego, CA.