

French Revolution and Napoleonic Period

Introductory remarks for morning lecture of Wednesday, 4-30-69: We will start today with the Napoleonic period which, in a sense, takes its root in the series of wars between England and France and the Holy Roman Empire—the Seven Years' War, the War of the Austrian Succession (page 470 in Langer)—in the middle of the 1700's, climaxes at the close of the 1700's and the beginning of the 1800's. And even though this Napoleonic Period may be over in 1815, one could say that the period extends on into the middle of the 1800's in terms of Europe proper. Whether you want to set it in France in the 1830's, in many of the countries in the period of civil strife in 1848, or whether we should say that it draws to a close by 1860 when new events take shape, one could at least conclude the following: With the year 1860, the modern world as we now know it suddenly began to take shape with events in Italy.

Later in the same lecture: On page 628 we have an important section: "Background of the Revolution." Then: "The spirit of the 18th century" was "a spirit devoted to the destruction or reformation of existing institutions." In other words, the 16th century or the 1500's was the century of the destruction or reformation of religious institutions; then the 18th century—200 years later and more—was the period of the destruction of political and social institutions (because these are harder to change since they have the military power behind them which the church does not—and that's why the Catholic Church always tries to tie up with a strong military power as will happen again in the near future).

Now, "Agrarian conditions": Notice that we see here that the French peasants were better off than ever before. Now, remember, it isn't a people who are in slavery who revolt; it's a people who are free who do the revolting! There are no revolts in Russia because the people are not free. The campus riots today are being carried out by the wealthy, the white, the rich, the liberal in the white community and the black people who are on campus who never had it so good before! This kind of thing brings it about—it's a strange situation. The Israelites would never have gotten out of Egypt if it hadn't been for God's help. They weren't about to revolt because they were too afraid of getting into more trouble with the Egyptians! "Yet as a whole French peasants were certainly better off than most European peasants, and they took part in the revolution, not because they were hopelessly downtrodden, but because they were well enough off to wish to better themselves." Take careful note of this statement which is very well put by our author!

Note that the middle class "read and listened to the philosophes", men who were almost universally atheists or agnostics!

Notice under "The National Assembly" that the classes in the Estates-General were arguing about the structure of government—just as they did in founding the Fourth Republic and the Fifth Republic. You see, the United States still is maintaining the First Republic! We have never had anything but one republic and one Constitution. In Germany under Hitler the government was the Third Reich—the third one. In the U. S. we've only had one. In France we have already had the fifth. This gives you an idea of what we mean by these terms. It's a form of government that continues without interruption—that's what a republic is. In Germany, of course, there have been long intervals between the three Reichs: The Hitler era was the Third; the Prussian era was the Second; and the Holy Roman Empire was the First. By contrast, the five republics in France have all existed since 1789. So in less than 200 years the French have had five republics. That's a part of the lack of stability in France!

Here is a summary of French government since the Revolution:

First Republic (1792-1804)

First Empire (1804-1815) Napoleon I

Bourbon Restoration (1815-1848) Louis XVIII, Charles X, Louis Philippe

Second Republic (1848-1851) Louis Napoleon

Second Empire (1852-1871) Napoleon III

Third Republic (1871-1940)

German Occupation (1940-1944) Vichy Government, Henri Petain; Free French Government—London, Charles de Gaulle

Fourth Republic (1946-1958)

Fifth Republic (1958-Present) Charles de Gaulle

-----  
 Page 629, first column: On July 14th, 1789 the Bastille was destroyed and Paris was "in the hands of the mob scarcely controlled by the electors...." Now you must understand the difference between Paris and other cities. In France, whoever controls Paris, in a sense, controls the nation. From the point of view of the city, Paris is France. Now even though there are other major cities in France, nobody thinks of other cities in France as even approaching Paris! In Germany it is different: Every major area has a major city. Berlin is only one; Hamburg is another; so is Munich; you could name Cologne—all of these are cities of great power. But the idea in France is quite different in the city structure: No city ranks on an equal par with Paris. And at this time, if the mob gets control of Paris and the electors claim they represent all of France, you have the question here of an immense city with immense power where the heart of the nation is.

-----  
 Notice carefully pages 632-633, an area which Dr. Hoeh has consistently emphasized over the years in this course, the period 1793-94. We have the Reign of Terror, Robespierre, abolition of the worship of God and the Cult of Reason, the revolutionary calendar, the Festival of the Supreme Being, and the fall of Robespierre—a period of crazed French minds!

-----  
 Page 633, the Treaty of Basel (1795, Mar. 5): Dr. Hoeh reads this entire paragraph, then comments: This means that the Prussians and the French dealt blows to destroy the Holy Roman Empire—which was a dead issue anyway; Prussia wanted to gain control of the German states which Austria had previously dominated, and France wanted to gain control. So that the revival, now, of the Holy Roman Empire was beginning to form in a new shape with the French on the one hand and the German states that linked themselves with France on the other (that were west of the Rhine, or on the left bank, so to speak, as you look north toward the mouth of the Rhine).... Dr. Hoeh skims over Napoleon's subsequent campaigns, then comes to page 637 and the Treaty of Luneville (1801, Feb. 9): This noteworthy treaty "practically involved the destruction of the Holy Roman Empire!" This indeed is a significant date although the final demise of the Empire did not come till 1806 (p. 641). And then note on page 638 that also in 1801 there was a Concorde' Between France and the Papacy. So this is an important date: We could say that the virtual destruction of the Holy Roman Empire of the Austrian line occurred in 1801; and France now, in exchange, makes a deal with the Papacy!

Then notice the next important step on page 640: In 1804 Napoleon becomes the em-

peror of France—"consecrated at Paris by Pope Pius VII on December 2. Napoleon placed the crown on his own head (in imitation of Pepin and Charlemagne.) So now Napoleon becomes the new Emperor of the restored Roman Empire in the West! That's what we mean by an "Emperor." He's not a king of France; he's emperor of an empire that is the restoration of the Roman Empire!

On the bottom of this page we have the "Formation of the Third Coalition" against France. Then the Battle of Trafalgar in which Nelson died of his wounds—see the lecture on "The Early Modern Period" for a detailed discussion of this key naval encounter. This was the single most important defeat of Napoleon before the final collapse of his empire because with this the French lose control of the sea. If the British had lost this battle, there would be little doubt that Napoleon would have won the war, Russia notwithstanding.

The Battle of Austerlitz (very bottom of page) was a great victory for Napoleon. Napoleon was a great general. However, the fatter he became with success, the more his victories declined. That is, the more he enjoyed the physical things of life as emperor the less successful were his victories.

On August 6 in 1806 (page 641) the Old Holy Roman Empire comes to its final end—the Austrian emperor lays down the old imperial crown.

Napoleon's struggles go on here and there as we see on the succeeding pages. Then on 645 we come upon the next significant event—Rome and the Papacy. There is trouble between Napoleon and the Pope. In 1809 the Papal States are declared incorporated into France. So Pius excommunicates Napoleon because of his high-handed attempt to dictate to the Church, and the Church wanted to dictate to Napoleon. This is very significant because now the Church and State are at each other's throats. And when this happens you can be sure that the Church will support all the enemies of Napoleon! The Pope was removed to Fontainebleau.

Next Napoleon decides to take on Russia at the same time as one and another of Napoleon's allies in Prussia and Austria declare war against France—his realm is breaking up. In the campaign against Moscow, the British tell the Russians to burn Moscow so that when Napoleon gets there he has no place for his troops in the terribly cold winter. This brought about the collapse of this great French victory as far as Moscow was concerned; that is, they got further than even the Germans under Hitler did in attacking Russia. The result is that Napoleon is defeated.

By 1814 he is forced to abdicate (page 650). He goes to the island of Elbe. But when the allies are discussing the peace treaty, he comes back to France in 1815 (pp. 651-2) and for a hundred days terrorizes Europe once more. And thus we have the great Battle of Waterloo which occurred, not in 1814, but in 1815! The restored Holy Roman Empire was finished in 1814 (see prophecy chart). Napoleon attempts to come back (like the Beast did later) for a hundred days; that failed. There was no real restoration of an empire—just an attempt to do so, you understand, but failing. The Battle of Waterloo in Belgium is very famous, of course. "The arrival of" the Prussian general" Blucher probably saved the day—he arrived toward evening. Napoleon thought that the Prussian had been defeated; in fact, he had withdrawn and came back along the side and saved the day. And, interestingly enough, all the French army that had not been destroyed by 1814—and generally it had not; only one small part of the army had met defeat in Russia. So the French troops were all there in the end of the war in 1814, even after the defeat of Napoleon when he came back. The cream of the French army had survived. And strangely enough, it seems as if the judgment on the French army and the French nation occurred in 1815 when almost all of the man power of France was slaughtered in this Battle of Waterloo! That was an interesting thing—you can read the Life magazine series on it.

With this we come to the end of the era of Napoleon. The Holy Alliance and the Congress System were an attempt to govern Europe from then on. Thus we have come to a turning point in European history.

Unification of Italy

After the period of Napoleon we should skip ahead to the stories of the unifications of Germany and Italy which led directly to the Hitler and Mussolini eras in our day. The story begins on page 700 in Langer (650 in old edition).

Pages 706-707: The situation here was that Napoleon III of France wanted to unite and control the northern Italian states. But it got out of his control and the states united on their own to oppose the Austrians. As part of this situation, there was an important effect on the Papal States in Central Italy leading to a fulfillment of a prophecy in Isaiah.

Now we have a situation—very important—beginning with 1859 there are insurrections in the Papal States which lead ultimately to the overthrow of the political dominion of the Catholic Church in Italy (that large central area). Now this is 70 years before a major event occurred in 1929 called the Lateran treaty (pp. 708, 1002). What we are concluding here is a unique situation that for 70 years the Catholic Church had no relationship that was proper with any of the states surrounding it. There were relationships technically with Austria and others, but these were not in the same category with the concordat that the Pope signed with Mussolini in 1929. The prophecy about the harlot who for 70 years is forgotten and who goes around the streets again singing the song of the harlot that's forgotten in Isa. 23:15-18—that 70 years is no doubt the period from 1859-1929 in its final fulfillment. Because the Church is finally pictured as getting very rich; and what it accumulates after that 70 years will be reserved for God's saints (verse 18 of Isa. 23).

On page 707 and onward we have the story of Count Cavour inspiring the idea of Italian unification politically and Garibaldi inspiring it militarily.

Page 707: On March 17 in 1861 the KINGDOM OF ITALY was "proclaimed by the first Italian parliament, with Victor Emmanuel as first king...." So there was war for 2 long years from 1859-61—civil war in Italy—before the goal was achieved!

Though Italy was united, the Pope still did not come to an agreement with the new government. Notice page 708, the first paragraph under "d. The Kingdom of Italy, 1870-1914"—read this entire paragraph, then note the last sentence: "This law was not accepted by the Pope, who henceforth posed as the prisoner of the Vatican"—that is, in the Vatican. "Relations between the Papacy and the Italian government were not regularized until the LATERAN TREATY of 1929" (p. 1002—also mentioned on the top of 714). Our author here is clearly not pro-Catholic in the way he writes this! The Pope was not made a prisoner—he only posed as one! This is the case. In this way there was no official relationship with the Italian government until 1929 as our last sentence tells us (top of page 660 in old edition of Langer).

Now the point is this: The Austrians of the Hapsburg house, and other states, might have had Concordats—the Church has had Concordats with Spain. But that does not mean that Austria or Spain or any other nation represents that Empire which the Church rides! Now the Church may make an agreement with other nations, but a mere concordat is not enough. What is important is that the nation with which the Church makes an agreement also is a nation which proposes to restore the Empire which is, in that sense, the old Holy Roman Empire. This is why any relationship with Austria had no meaning because Austria had disbanded the Holy Roman Empire, remember, in 1806 in its final form—really in 1801; 1804, 1806 were stages in its demise which you should remember from the Napoleonic period. The important thing, however, is that when Italy started to re-unite, it was the beginning of the unification of two places in Europe which would lead to the refounding of the Holy Roman Empire for a sixth time! Now Mussolini later then proclaimed it when his final invasion occurred. But the Church began to recognize that Italy was the state in Europe which would be the one it must come to an agreement with. You see, since the fall of Rome in 476, and then the res-

toration of Justinian in 554, Italy has never united. Between 554 and later it was never united. You see why then, when it was united, the Church either had to dominate it or be dominated by it! Because prior to the unification it was divided either between Sarcens in the south, Byzantine Empire, the Lombards, Charlemagne's realm, the Papal States, the Kingdom of Normandy—all these people one way or another had some control in it, and it was never united, and the Church was riding an empire up in the north. But now, with the unification of Italy, the Pope faced a problem: Here the Italians got rid of the Papal States and despised the Church because it had supported the Austrian hegemony of Italy prior to 1859. I think it should be plain why for 70 years the Italians hated the Church, let's say, as an institution—and why many of them still do today as Communists even though they were baptized Catholics.

-----  
 Pages 712-713: Dogma of the Immaculate Conception, condemnation of "progress, liberalism, and contemporary civilization," dogma of papal infallibility, Kultur-kampf—a battle over culture with the Pope which Bismark did not win!  
 -----

Unification of Germany

Page 716: The German Zollverein—customs union—is comparable to the beginning of the Common Market.

Page 718: Frederick William IV (1840-61) wanted to revive the Holy Roman Empire—read the paragraph carefully.

Page 728: Read carefully the description of Otto von Bismarck!

-----  
 Page 736: Germany's astounding victory in the Franco-Prussian War led, in 1871, to the FOUNDATION OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE! Read the paragraph carefully. On Jan. 18 William I was proclaimed German Emperor in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles. So here we have the new Reich which was the first restoration of the German Reich since Otto the Great founded it in 962. The old Reich continued, you see, all along till after the collapse of Napoleon; and now the Reich was reborn. This was said to be a kind of restoration of the Roman Empire of that day. It was the Second Reich. The Third Reich was set up by Hitler. Now we are not dealing here with a factual restoration. It was a German realm—it was a beginning. Let's say that the story of Italy in the First World War and the German Reich in WW I was not the story of a Roman Empire yet—it had not yet been so proclaimed. It was the founding of the building blocks that would unite as an axis between Hitler and Mussolini that led to the final proclamation by Mussolini of the Roman Empire. These were the building blocks. It was a difficult thing to get it started again. (5-1-69, Thursday morning lecture)

\*\*\*\*\*

Compendium Volume Two

Dr. Hoeh is discussing the matter of Shem and his descendents settling in Europe: Everybody has assumed, in modern Christianity, that the Children of Shem settled Asia and the Middle East, Ham in Africa, and Japheth in Europe. This is all wrong! You'll find some Bible maps that even indicate that all the Orientals come from Shem. It's just the opposite. Now when you look at Johannes Turmair, you will discover that he places almost all of the sons of Shem in Europe. And, in fact, the names are there. You'll be surprised how many Chaldean, Hebrew, Aramaic, Assyrian names are right there. This is the proper explanation. And that alone clearly indicates that not only did Turmair have the Bavarian chronicles all the way back, but that Annius of Viterbo who came from Germany, had access to them—and instead of inventing them he merely copied them. These were indeed, then, royal annals (pp. 13-14). (From the Wednesday morning lecture of 5-7-69.)

From the Thursday morning lecture of 5-8-69. Dr. Hoeh is discussing Chapter 3 in volume two about Abraham in early Europe: Here in Chapter 3 we have the story of what was happening in Austria in 1945—we have a picture of Abraham fleeing his home land at the time when his older brother Haran was slain for religious reasons (Gen. 11:28). He stayed there for 3 years until 1942 and then in 1941 God called Abraham to forsake his kindred and go into a land "that I will show you." Now Abraham had in mind that he would like to go to the land of the Danube again—he was planning that, that seems clearly indicated. The Austrian Chronicle doesn't even know the difference, in fact, between the land of the Jews which is Palestine, and that which was later known as the land of the Jews which was the region of Austria on the Danube—Judeisapta, "the Jews' land," is the term applied. Today we would speak of Juden landt. There must have been an old term then, sapta, which meant "land"—so translated in the Chronicle. (See pages 26-27.)

In other words, Abraham was planning to migrate where the other Hebrews were on the Danube, see? Here were all the other Hebrew tribes of the family of Joktan (as discussed in Chapter 2—Genesis 10:25-31). But what happened, of course, is obvious: God said to him, "Now I want you to go to a land that I will show you—not the one where you are planning to go"—and He took him down to the wastes of the land of Canaan! The reason should be obvious: If he had been among the Hebrews, he would have been living just like most of his relatives and wouldn't have been able to break the shades of family relationships and foolishness of false culture. But when he got down to the land of the Canaanites, there was no problem there! It was easy not to be a Canaanite!! You know, this is partly the case: There are some cultures that you are taken in by—the TV, the clothing styles, the music; you know, the culture around us is not as easy to shake as if you were in the land of the Navajo, for example! It's easy not to be a Navajo but it is not always easy not to be a typical American. And this is the very reason God chose to call Abraham to a different land!

-----  
 Abraham was born in 2016. Isaac was born in the spring of 1915.  
 -----

From the Wednesday morning lecture of 5-14-69. Dr. Hoeh is discussing page 123 on Spanish history: Then we have the break up of Spain—"Chaos in Spain" (bottom of 122). Now there is little doubt but what we have a migration of Israelites into Spain in the period 1433-1400. Note: In the third year of Romus, son of Testa, "Liber Pater," whose name was Bacchus, reduced Spain to his sway. He was from the East. This same title belonged to "Hu the Mighty" or "Hesus the Mighty" of Celtic tradition. That is an unusual fact. The reason for it is that anciently Dionysius or Bacchus was a man who was a great conqueror. He was originally the pre-Flood Tubalcain who, when he went through an area, left a solitude! When Joshua was finished with the land of Palestine—the Canaanites—there was also a solitude!! This is why Joshua was also called Dionysius (Bacchus). And this marks the beginning of the settlement of Israelites there.

.....After 1149 there is a break-up—there is no longer any royalty in Spain. The list just stops. And the history goes on in Anderson's Royal Genealogies with this list of SEA POWERS. The dates are slightly different from the list in volume one of the Compendium. Whoever controlled the Iberian Peninsula and Gibraltar could control the Mediterranean—the Italian peninsula was not a factor!

Why Anderson left out the 131 years of the PELASGIANS is a real puzzle—the period 1101-970! He left out this vast period of over a century which should be assigned to the Pelasgians. Now we should be aware of an important archaeological tie-in: At a certain point in history, after the unification, coming out of the previous Spanish culture is a great expansion into all of Central and Western Europe—which includes the British Isles, parts of Scandinavia and Ireland—of a people who are identified under the name of "the Beaker Culture." For years I puzzled over what this "beaker culture" is because there's no evidence of Spain ever dominating

Western Europe—including Ireland, England, France, Gaul, parts of Germany, down the Danube, into Denmark—all over Western Europe there is a huge explosion out of Spain of a particular culture before the Mycenaean world of the 9th, 8th, and 7th centuries. This could be none other than the days of David and Solomon—the Israelite-Sidonian sea power (because there was a combination of these two on the sea). And it started in Spain because it was in Spain that all—that is, from Spain—all of Western Europe was finally influenced, because the Spaniards that were there were not all Spaniards as you and I think of them! During this very period, one branch of them with royalty exploded into Ireland—and hence this is the story of the Milesian Scots, who came anciently out of Scythia, wandered through the Mediterranean, and ended up in Spain. The royal family we then can trace in history. Non-royal families you cannot trace in history but only in archaeology! (This is an important principle for the study of history. In the afternoon lecture Dr. Hoeh stated it a little different way: He said chronicles—Saxon, Bavarian, Austrian, what have you—pertain to royal families. If there is no royal family, there is no chronicle!!) The royal families came from Troy to Western Europe; and wherever they settled, the people who were Israelites in Spain were migrating to those areas. And hence the explosion in trade in the Beaker Culture (which is named after a certain kind of vessel that developed in Spain). It is clear then that the Beaker Culture is at the time of the Pelasgian sea power. And this period of sea power was in part situated in Spain because the picture indicates that Joshua already not only pursued the Canaanites in Palestine, but even pursued them in part out of Spain—and then settled some of the Children of Israel there (p. 123) from which there were migrations, according to the Welsh legends, into Gaul and Britain.

The following material on the Ethiopian King List is from the Wednesday afternoon lecture of 5-14-69. Begin page 337 in volume two: Notice that the line begins in 1978 with the son of Joktan! The line comes all the way down to 975 where we come to Makeda—who is the Queen of Sheba! (Bottom of page 339 to top of 340.) She in part descended from the line of Saba, the Abd Shems (or Jerah—page 337)—this was called the Line of Katan, we know that; but this line intermarried with the family of Sheba. And these rulers were ultimately the rulers of Sheba, but they started out as a partly Hebrew line from Joktan! Now you can see why they call the people of Ethiopia the Caucasoids of Africa—and Armenoids of Africa. There was this ancient inter-mixture of black and white stocks.

Notice that the Queen of Sheba falls exactly in 975. If I had had this list while I was in college I could have solved the whole of Egypt for all practical purposes. But I just didn't know it existed! But this material then becomes an independent method of proof. Along with the list of Sea Powers and the history of China in volume one (which is correct straight back to 2254), this Ethiopian history ranks as one of the greatest proofs that the Compendium reconstruction of ancient history is correct!

The list on page 340 goes on to Menelik I, the son of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. I take it that Hatshepsut adopted her grandson as her son because she had only a daughter who married Solomon. After Menelik comes Hanyon—and then Zerah the Ethiopian, the grandson! You want to know why Zerah the Ethiopian came back to Palestine in the days of Asa? (II Chronicles 14.) Because he felt he had a right to the throne of Solomon! He was going to take it over!

Skip ahead all the way to page 353 where we have Haile Selassie I, the current ruler. Then we come to page 354: Here is the line of Ori called Aram. Carefully read the note under Gariak I. Now look: We come from Aram down to number 8, Snefru. And Snefru was the father-in-law of Job—his dates are the same as those we already had arrived at in volume one! And notice that the entire list here (back on 354) begins with the sensible date of 2222 which was the story of the settlement under Dynasty I of Cush—and I never knew what to do with that date—you look at Dynasty I

of Egypt in volume one of the Compendium. You will find 2222 as one of the years given for the beginning of the settlement there. And the list here starts in 2222 and goes down to 1726 for Snefru. Even though Jacob came down to Egypt in 1725, this goes back to the previous year. And then the list stops in 936, the year that Zerah got smashed in Palestine!

And then on page 356 we have Ham who is pre-dated to 2255 (instead of 2254). The list comes down to Piori II (page 357) who was the father of the Ethiopian woman whom Moses married when he won the war in Nubia in 1527. The event ends in the autumn of 1527, Moses returned to Egypt—and his 40th year was now nearly over. He was there, he decided to go the Children of Israel, got in trouble, and finally fled. And the time of his fleeing must have been in the end of winter—something like that—in 1526, 40 years before the Exodus (1486). This therefore would be—the 1527—40 years and 6 months before the Exodus, and would be proper. To place the Exodus in 1487 would not really give 40 years from it back to the flight of Moses, see? So this is even a better dating.