

I wandered lonely as
a cloud reflection



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

It is through the poem "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud" by William Wordsworth that the reader can recognize everything nature has to offer. Wordsworth opens this poem by claiming that he is a cloud observing the nature underneath him. From here he sees a large field of daffodils, then further describes the deeper meaning of these flowers using a series of poetic devices. In the second and third stanzas, Wordsworth glorifies the image of the daffodils. He describes them as endless and "continuous as the stars that shine".

It is interesting to note how he describes the flowers in contrast to other works about nature. While other authors usually describe scenes of nature as temporary and ever-changing, Wordsworth hints at the permanent nature of these daffodils. Additionally, he uses the poetic device of foregrounding when he says "ten thousand saw I at a glance". Wordsworth most likely used foregrounding here to emphasize his words when describing the vastness of the daffodils. In the last stanza, the poet reveals that this image is only the thought of a "pensive" thinker.

This is marked by the change in the tenses, as Wordsworth switches from the past tense to the present tense. He highlights that whenever he is in a bad mood, he pictures himself as the cloud admiring the daffodils. Finally, the last line of the poem connects back to the beginning as an effort to conclude the piece. Wordsworth explains how his heart fills with pleasure and then "dances with the daffodils", similar to earlier when he claimed how they "[flutter] and [dance] in the breeze." It is clear that the memory of the daffodils is imprinted in his mind and soul to be cherished forever.

When he's feeling lonely, dull or depressed, he thinks of the daffodils and cheers up. The full beauty of the flowers and nature did not strike him at first, but as he became lonely and sad he realized the emotional escape they provide. of law. These strict codes made Sweden very prosperous by having well-controlled citizens and fewer riots. Soon he became a renowned ruler throughout Europe. The impact of this was very great and allowed Sweden to advance in warfare. With the citizens under control and their natural rights stripped, Charles XII went onto defeat Russia in the Battle of Narva.

Russian soldiers lost about 10, 000 men at the end of the battle, while the Swedish troop only lost 667. (Wikipedia, Absolutism). It is through this consolidation of power that the aspect of fear is introduced and is able to play a major part in absolutism. Another benefit that the consolidation of power brings is that it allows less power to be held within the Church.

Whether it was revealed in the 95 thesis or through other incidents, there is no question that the Church has manipulated its followers many times throughout European history.

With complete power in the hands of the French ruler King Louis XIV, he was able to recognize the negative sides of Church power and finally subdue it. He passed the 1721 regulation that specifically delineated what the clergy could do and therefore used his power for the well-being of France (Wikipedia, Absolutism). He knew that France would be better without any Church influence at all, and this decision impacted France greatly. There is no doubt that the ability to consolidate power to one individual that absolutism became the most effective form of government in 17th and 18th century Europe.

While there were many benefits for consolidating power, absolute rulers were also able to suppress the natural rights of man, which is another reason an absolute government was the best fit for 17th and 18th century Europe. To begin, kings suppressed these rights under the idea that they obtain a “divine right”, which means that their power was given by God. Therefore, no one else should abuse rights except for the king (Vidljinic). King James I of England believed that the almighty head of the state should be the only one with rights.

He claimed that “kings are gods lieutenants of Earth” and essentially stated that the power of the king should compare with the power of God (Document 2). Thus, kings like King James I did not believe that most citizens were worthy enough to obtain natural rights, and therefore they suppressed them. He did this through creating laws that limited the sharing of ideas of people, such as abolishing a free press and strictly persecuting people who had radical ideas. This idea did him well during his rule, mainly because he was able to obtain complete power (Vidljinic).

Thus, he did not fall to revolutionary ideas as much as other kings, like Joseph II, who did not suppress natural rights as much (Wikipedia, Absolutism). Additionally, the lack of education of most of the population throughout Europe was only another justification for the suppression of natural rights. The absolute rulers felt as if the majority of their people were not educated enough to handle natural rights. For example, during the rule of King Louis XVI, the majority of France was uneducated, poor peasants.

If natural rights weren't suppressed, it is clear that these people would be rather dangerous after they obtained them (World History Center). Granted the right to vote, these people would not have the incentive to look into elections and perhaps elect a corrupt group of rulers. King Louis XVI even stated that "the more you grant, the more [they] claim" (Document 3). Clearly, King Louis XVI is attempting to say that people are naturally greedy and will try to abuse the rights they are given.

This relates to the philosophical ideas of Thomas Hobbes, where he states that man is not by "nature a social animal" and that "society [can] not exist except by the power of the state" (Coleman). It is obvious that the suppression of natural rights was essential for the well-being of the citizens in 17th and 18th century Europe, and are a main reason that an absolute government is best for this time. It is from the consolidation of power and the suppression of natural rights that an absolute ruler is able to focus on other important aspects of their country, such as the economy.

In 17th and 18th century Europe an absolute government allowed important economic advances. To begin, the fact that one ruler had control of every part of the country allowed economic decisions to be far more effective. Rulers were able to control everything about the economy: taxes, tariffs, prohibitions, harbor tolls, etc. (World History Center) It is from these extensive economic benefits of absolute rule that the great system of mercantilism arose. Mercantilism was an economic policy put into affect by the crown that believed in the benefits of profitable trading and commercialism (Free Dictionary).

The government made this policy so that they could economically benefit from the system. For example, the Spanish crown enormously profited from the system of mercantilism during their discovery of the New World. With the Spanish crown the only source of rule, they were allowed to obtain raw materials in South America and then manufacture them throughout Europe. Additionally, Peter the Great of Russia was seen as a respected economic visionary and utilized his powers to better his nation's economy.

Peter the Great abolished the land tax and household tax and replaced them with a poll tax. The taxes on land and on households were payable only by individuals who owned property or maintained families; the new head taxes, however, were payable by serfs (Saint- Petersburg). The rise of mercantilism and the emergence of new taxes are quintessential examples of why absolutism is the most effective form of government for Europe during this time period. Just like absolutist governments allow a nation to have many economic benefits, it can also allow military advances.

With complete control in the hands of one individual, military action was able to be completed more efficiently and effectively in 17th and 18th century Europe. For example, Frederick the Great of Prussia obtained one of the best militaries of the time due to his absolute power. Frederick the Great hoped to unite and modernize his vulnerable and disconnected lands, and therefore he set off with a mission to accomplish this goal (Showalter). He focused on keeping his soldiers intact and obedient, and was known to be one of the most feared officers of all time.

In fact, he once claimed that the soldiers “ should fear their general more than they fear the enemy” (Showalter). It is from this absolute mindset that he was able to successfully win many wars against his main enemy, Austria. He is famed for defeating the Austrian province of Silesia, which gave Prussia control over the Oder River (Showalter). The main reason he won battles like these were because of the high salaries issued to the soldiers. As an absolute ruler, he could control the salaries for the military, and making them high was a great incentive for more people to join.

Additionally, it gave current soldiers more incentive to fight in hopes of obtaining a higher position. Military accomplishments like these expanded Prussia’s territory tremendously during the 18th century, and ultimately united their disconnected lands. Clearly, an absolute government was beneficial to the militaries throughout Europe during the 17th and 18th century. In conclusion, it is apparent that in an absolute government it is easier to consolidate power while suppressing natural rights and still advancing militarily and economically.

For these reasons, an absolutist government was far more efficient and suitable for the 17th and 18th century European people. However, it is important to note these ideas are fit for 17th and 18th century Europe because society needed someone to dictate their rights. Given the current needs of society and the greater importance of being educated, it is still debatable if an absolute government would be the best fit for current society. Perhaps history is suggesting that human beings only need to be controlled by one ruler when they are unable to make decisions that help the greater good of a nation.