

Politics Lecture

Baroque being more sensual as exemplified, in his famous line where Galileo subvert all of philosophy is that of shapes and Geometry

Can we tell about what was the religious attitude of Galileo? 1. For one thing in Italy, as there was more up close relation to the pope they were criticize the pope as is

2. Galileo as is portray himself as down to earth guy, where he doesn't commit himself to a big metaphysical thesis

So is his trouble that he doesn't commit himself, to some degree it is as the issues of the time is that you need to be not too provocative, unlike our period he doesn't see it as essential virtue. It is better to not be placed in an inescapable corners.

Within the court you don't need to be a fanatical in your religious as it need to be an interesting place.

===

So if we want to get to a Baroque-esque manner in the text will go to pg. 320 of the Assyer:

Remember that the argument is whether or not the telescope enlarge the falling star more, the assumption is the closer the angle the larger it would enlarge and as the star is far away the angle is close to zero it wouldn't enlarge

Sed contra Galileo show that Ptolemy was wrong based on the observation in Venus where it is clearly move across the sun and in "Now imagine [...] very little" - The claim is that we are placed in a mask ball, and the ball is the court of the scientific arena, hence the stars are with a wig.

The wig of Venus is really big and the wig of the moon is really small, the wig exemplify the illumination of Venus. And as they are not so different only the extraneous wig they would be the same.

"The luminous object... by the eye itself" - the light of the star is exaggerated due to the reflection in the eye. The superlative exaggeration hide something, and in Galileo case it reveal the truth even though it is not as beauty.

"This will see [...] or not at all" There is small body and a very large halo, as the halo is happening in the eye the telescope replace the eye and remove the affect to the bare reality it reflects.

"This is so [...] well distinguished" - thus the telescope enlarge all the other stars equally

There is in a baroque tension between the material world and the abstract truth. In that sense Galileo operate that he is working within dichotomy of the Baroque.

His example is used to trivialize the difference of the angle

Descartes

As Descartes correspondence with Elizabeth she asks how is it that we are able to understand the rainbow given dualism.

Then Descartes try to explain it using the body. This give another image not the Philosophical Descartes that focus on the mine nor the image of the Scientific Descartes with his "scientific activities"

In the original releases the books were laden with illustration

In the midst of this Scientific inquiry you can see his attempt in reaching philosophical life.

When he need to describe a law governing reality that understood in geometry by giving example of someone playing tennis, this is more concrete, this type of illustration tradition start in Holland where a prince who try to train engineers so they supplied illustration with complicated geometry.

In doing so people took that reality is destined by this abstract geometry, you can see it in other handbooks for swordsmanship or Ballet where it is taken that by calculating angles you can understand how to hit with the sword better or dance better, this of course goes to army where armies organized in geometrical shapes.

Returning to Descartes is also maintain a stoic life within himself that he is external to the world.

The question arise, is it that Descartes try to create image to himself, self-aspiration.

Elizabeth critique him on being a loner while she is maintaining public life in the court.

This arise another tension where in the essay about self-discovery the lack of curiosity and be full with what you have as source of knowledge while the new science ascribe that you need to crave new knowledge in order to attain it.

So we are dealing with two arguments, the basis of which first is that there is dualism. This argument wasn't just theoretical but they also deploy mode of control this change the mode of knowledge passing to not be by maintenance of secrets of nature

The role of Baroque mode of knowledge is revealing secrets that we will never be solved fully and each allegory would increase the spread of his mystery. Descartes here put the scientist as someone that comprehend the natural system fully it give a concrete representation.

This transform the garden from an engine of allegories you try to find in never ending manner. On the other hand the Cartesian garden will become a mechanical image that is graspable and reproducible.

The allegory behind is that of the king which the question is if he is understandable in his powers or not.

How is it related to sovignity? This take us back to Bodin and Machiavelli, whether Power is a sort of beast you tame partially or whether it is a sort of mechanism that operate.

The Cartesian garden both create an image with discrete order and in the same time it doesn't alienate the viewer.

Who is the viewer? It is done in a moment in history where it give to the court immediate access and by it create standard

Lectio Hobbes

Usually Hobbes is not brought up in a political context when being brought philosophically. But he was active politically and unlike Spinoza or Descartes who hide their political involvement Hobbes was publicly involved and didn't try to hide his involvement.

How much are they trying to look to answer for the whole compared to small scope question?

During the period there was reshaping of what is considered scholarship after the fall of university, this involves what count as authoritative text, what count as legitimate field of knowledge, what are the boundary of legitimate philosophical discourse and all of this arise in a world with a constant civil war, war that is partially informed by answer about universals.

During the period there is a civil war which in its hight the king got executed, a series of event that was in the midst of Boyle and Hobbes life, and from it they try to form a stable political system.

Leviathan and the air pump is important because it put a strong image toward socializing science.

The traditional view of History of Science that history is directed by the development of the scientific thought this lead to question about major works and how they relate to scientific discoveries. You do not ask biographical questions or touch upon correspondences

This was a major thesis till the 1970s, afterwards arose a critique from Kuhn that the movement itself is not clean but include sub steps and more aesthetically motion, and the scientific truth relevancy is bound to this

This thesis is taken by J.D. Bernal who wrote a Marxist history of science on how technology shifts the super structure. While he was well sited in Academia (despite his Marxist involvement during the cold war), his students were alienated and gathered at Edgborough university.

At the time Durkheim offered a preformative theory about religion and the shaping of society.

Those students take the Marxist understanding that History formed from the praxis of life rather than theoretical ideas, and that in depth of thought there is attempt to organize.

For example you offer explanation to both the failure and the success of a theory and not alienate the mistakes. Why a certain theory involved in the deeper context. Shapin was a student of them and argue from this standpoint that the phoingston failed not just because the veracity of the claim but also social issues revolving Hobbes

This is unlike Kuhn which try to make history only part of the ideas but the Storng Thesis try to make it wholesome.

Popper argue that what lead to discovery is open-ended. However the justification need to be tight based on observation. The strong thesis argue against the latter that there is also historical process involved that lead to it being taken as true.

How do they limit the role of History

As the context of the theory become important it become a criterion in itself

The role of psychology and sociology as the prime criterion

Good example for sociological history of knowledge?

The critique against Biogili about methodology. However Shapin had a good argument and methodology so much so it became a classic.

Along with it he solved with it argument on the connection between religion, science and the civil war.

A student of Weber named Melton published an article on how the puritan's philosophy conduct scientific inquiry.

Later on it arose in the context of Marxist and Anti-Marxist historiography.

Christopher Hill join the argument he argue it wasn't a civil war but an English revolution and due to that there was development in scientific fields.

This argument concluded with Barbara Milton, when she points out that it is not clear what the radical science do with the winning solution which is monarchist.

Shapin offer a solution by remolding the framework, by setting the royal society as involving a sort of middle way.

He distinguish between radical science which embed within it Alchemy and other forms of knowledge vs The Cartesian scientist who put materialist in front, per exemplar in 1652 a man named John Webster, a priest in the revolutionary side, write a book against Universities who he take them to be ancient and too Aristotelean and offer a new form of University that will include anti-Aristotelean arthritis. Politically Oxford was the university of the king and in the context of Cromwell reform are target to attack by the revolutionaries.

To him John Wilkins and Seth Ward answer him that the allegation are false and that they are Baconian.

This group would be involved in this are also involved in the forming of the Royal Society, how much they were pro reform they took that the reform went too far and there need to be a separation.

Shapin focus the discourse around a particular experiment around the pump.

One need to remember that Wilkins, who become a bishop of the Anglican church, that was dealing with radical science with books like Mathematical Magick

This highlight that where you are in a theory also involves you politically

Cavendish and Westphalia agreement

There is an argument between two people one support Jean Bodin Thesis that sovereignty was always the same and another one supported Machiavelli that sovereignty is ethereal.

There is a difference between Bodin question where Sovereignty is taken as an abstract concept and Machiavelli which take it more as praxis. Difference that come in the virtue.

There is question how adventurous the way the person try to attain power

Another consideration is Raison d'etat how much is the action of the leaders done are done to the greater good.

There is an argument after the Westphalia peace of how to be crowned given it is not tradition. In some regards this extent to the source of legitimacy When Friedreich crown himself have a poetic aspect, in which he create out of nothing his kingship, this give sense of frivolousness and self creation of the crown.

Summery

We've started with the dispute between Bodin to Machiavelli as a pre-modern dispute to mark the change involved in our discourse, whereby we checked how the conflict between the church and the king became less important form before in the 13th-14th century. The way England moved out of the church and how the HRE self crowning removed the sting out of those older disputes, be it local duke power against the king(as sovereignty become an abstract concept) or as said before with the church.

We need to be aware of ascribing influence of ideas, it is often not direct and can be gathered from other sources, in the 16th century the influence can ascribed from Technological changes, Changes in Economical thought, The Pope return to Rome and the unification of the Church. The return of the pope leading that the old justification of his kingship not being enough.

If the old question were for example between the two swords, The promise to god in kingship, who have the rights to tax the people or gather armies; those kind of questions in one point are not enough. Here Machiavelli give other answers with different question around building power and virtue. Those answers are so good that the old questions debase themselves. From this arise a new question about Sovereignty.¹

So we saw how Sovierginitiy can be used as a way to puzzle a way to from a road to the 17th century and how we can relate it to knowledge, which we saw that the way their were strategies to mythcize and create allegories to the power, and then we saw another mode where give Knowledge a way to control with the instrumental reasoning abilities, we showed that this change the concept of sovereignty as the main architect and the executor through the New Science.

In some of the masks of Ben Johnson, which he wrote in the end of life of Queen Elizabeth I, he give the traditional account of the virtue and few of the virtues bring a glass ball to the queen where she see herself in eternal manner in rather suprising manner. This sort of seeing yourself as a mythical being and that also how he create his power.

The New Science split this storytelling and lead the king to gain power by instrumental usage. So while they were aware of the mythical substance but in the same time they don't find it as enough to create power and thus they try to change the story.

Two examples can highlight it: The one is when Galileo look in the telescope where he see the circular movement of Noga and the rings of Saturn and put it as an anagram riddle. However the riddle is unanswerable. His point that knowledge is not attained by reading a book but through looking in the telescope, However he still uses allegories. Thus we are still in the same playground but the content of which is changed.

Another example is the Ars Poeticae of Varleer you see a painter from the 16th century painting Clio, on the side there is a stack of masks and on the other side there is the map of Holland. Svetlana Alpers argue in The Art of Describing,

¹This type of question arise in the writing of Hans Blumenberg, The Legitimacy of the Modern Age, which point out a paradox in modern life that we are new and better and from the other side there is question in virtue of what I am better in being new without any tradition that justify it. And the whole point that if we start in blank page in virtue of what do I draw the first line where I decide to draw it.

In one point he tries to argue for Kuhnian model and how we retroactively try to create an historical bridge between the gaps. For example how the Renaissance as a concept involve back and back more and more

The progression he present William of Ockham which unable to answer to Nicholas of Cusa which give answer about infinite to

that this historical map is put against Clio. Clio who put a story bigger than life in History while the map give a realistic look. I add that we need to go through the stack of mask, through the Mythical layer.