**[美]亨德里克•威廉•房龙：《美国简史》**

**张玉立、颜震译**

原著第25章：

Chapter 25

Mr. Thomas Jefferson Of Albemarle County, Virginia, Shows The Superior Advantages Of A Classical Education

Until some fifty or sixty years ago it was the custom to look back upon the Middle Ages as a highly colorful period of pageants and princesses-in-distress and saints and torture-racks, a sort of glorified melodrama that had lasted almost ten centuries.

The modern historian has clone some very useful blasting among the picturesque but dangerous ruins of a none too charming past. We now know that the men and women of the eighth and the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries were really very much like ourselves, that the differences which strike us as so very important were merely, artificial differences, and that underneath their mailed shirts and their velvet coats our ancestors were animated by the same ambition that keeps us going the all-over-powering desire to survive.

And one of the fields in which we were obliged to modify our opinions

was that of architecture.

Our grandfathers looked at a medieval town and said, "Those huge walls and towers are very interesting. They were of course constructed to protect the inhabitants of the cities from attack on the part of their enemies, the rober-barons and the kings."

To-day we know that that was only part of the truth. The medieval system of defense had a twofold purpose: it was expected to keep the enemy outside and the citizens inside.

For those noble fights and sieges of which we read with so much pleasure in the novels of Sir Walter Scott were rather dismal affairs from the point of view of the average man.

The people of the Middle Ages were not familiar with the idea of nationalism. They were loyal to their own home but rarely thought in terms of nations or states. They accepted emperors and kings just as we accept many institutions which we do not exactly like but which happen to exist and which are so well entrenched that we feel powerless before them.

When the King of France went to war with the King of Spain, it was of course to be expected that the troops of the King of France would besiege the fortified towns of the King of Spain and that the troops of the King of Spain would besiege the fortified towns of the King of France and that the garrisons of the towns which belonged to the King of France would do their best to keep the fortress entrusted to their care safe for their master in Paris and that the garrisons of the towns which belonged to the King of Spain would fight like demons to protect their redoubts and bastions from the sullying touch of the Valois mercenaries.

Meanwhile the poor distracted burghers were expected to suffer and starve in silence until the fight was decided, when they were plundered by the victorious enemy or were asked to bestow such a large share of their worldly goods upon the brave fellows who were supposed to have protected them that they were ruined in either case.

I need not tell you that they did not like this. And as soon as they had eaten a sufficient number of rats and mice to have shown a decent sense of loyalty, they were apt to open the gates of their town and say to both contending parties, "Do whatever you please, but for Heaven's sake make an end to this foolish hacking and shooting and let us go back to business." It was of course the duty of the garrison to prevent such treason. Hence, as I said before, the fortifications of the Middle Ages served a twofold purpose and they were built in such a way that the garrison could turn its bullets and arrows upon friend and enemy alike.

The men who took charge of the American Revolution resembled a medieval garrison. For not only must they keep the Britishers out but at the some time they must prevent the loyalists from making common cause with the English.

Now that it is all over we are apt to forget that the number of people who remained loyal to the King was very large. Almost without exception these troublesome citizens belonged to the richer classes and that was their undoing. Since time immemorial they had been professional moneylenders. In this opacity they had incurred the deep and lasting hatred of the small farmers.These same small farmers were now soldiers in the army of independence.They had a chance to get even. And they were so vociterous in their public declarations about the fate that awaited any "traitor" that the loyalists, willy hilly, were forced to keep mouse-still. If the Americans had lost the war, it is hard to say what they would have done. But the rebels from the very beginning held their own and the loyalists never squeaked.

The problem of the English was not settled quite so easily. The British government, according to the latest reports from London, was hiring every available mercenary on the Continent for the purpose of bringing the colonists to terms. But the prospect of such an invasion did not cause Washington and his advisers to spend too many candles in midnight deliberations. They had seen enough of the English professional officers not to fear them overmuch.

Furthermore they were familiar with the country, they knew the sort of tactics that were best suited for fighting in the wilderness, and they were close to their own base of supplies. No, the prospect of a campaign against the clumsy German peasants of His Majesty did not disturb them overmuch.

The problem that caused them profound anxiety was this: would the good feeling that now seemed to animate the whole country hold out to the end?

Could they keep their men and the civilian population together until the common enemy should have been defeated ?

Sooner or later it was to be decided, not only whether Englishmen or Americans should rule over these fertile regions along the Atlantic seaboard, but also which of two contending factions should be the dominant party in the American nation, the Aristocrats, the merchants and money-lenders of the we of the Democrats, the farmers and small storekeepers of the frontier?

Now that the enemy stood before the gate, cooperation was the first essential of success. And in order to bring about such cooperation, it was necessary to devise a platform upon which the two parties could unite, if only for a short time, if only for a couple of months or years.

Washington was too busy drilling his recruits to occupy himself with that mask, John Adams was lacking in that personal magnetism, in that power of intimate persuasion without which nothing could be accomplished in a gathering of such diversified elements as had now met for the second time in William Penn's ancient capital. Once more a Virginian came to the rescue.

Thomas Jefferson, like Washington, was a southerner. He also belonged to the best families of the land, for his father had married a Randolph. But there the comparison between the two men ceased. For Washington was by birth and environment an "aristocrat"-member of that small group of plantation owners which at an early date had taken possession of the fertile soil of the lowlands. Whereas Jefferson was a true child of the frontier, had spent his early youth among the farmers of the distant Blue Ridge Mountains and had seen very little of the more artificial civilization of the East until he went to the college which Dutch William and his English wife had founded in Williamsburg in the year 1693.

Early in the sixteenth century it was said of Erasmus, the great humanist, that he liked the Popish way of living but the Lutheran way of thinking. With an equal degree of truthfulness it can be stated of Jefferson that he liked the aristocratic way of thinking and the democratic way of living.

Washington, while fighting the armies of the King of England, was quite willing to be called His Excellency and allowed himself to be surrounded with a pomp that in the eyes of his many enemies smacked suspiciously of that royal etiquette which was supposed to fill the hearts of all good patriots with unfeigned disgust.

Far different, Jefferson. Since early childhood he had been plain Tom to all his neighbors of Albemarle County. He thoroughly despised those graces of life which the hardy men of the frontier regarded as unnecessary affectation on the part of a race of weaklings. But when it came to that independence of min which is most often found among those who have never been obliged to worry about their daily bread and butter, then Jefferson was an aristocrat of the aristocrats.

There seems to be a common belief that revolutions are made by the down-trodden and poverty-stricken multitudes of the slums. Alas! Those poor, dumb masses of underfed humanity play only a secondary role. When they are needed, they are called upon to serve as cannon-fodder. The actual work of tearing down and building up is clone by men with a different sort of background. And foremost among the ranks of those who have risked their lives and their personal comfort for the sake of an ideal stands the type of radical aristocrat of whom Jefferson was so true and noble a representative.

Like Washington, Jefferson also suffered bitterly at the hands of those who failed to understand him. Like Washington, he was envied, slandered, maligned and vilified with a bitterness that seems incredible to these later generations.

And like Washington (and all truly great men) he accepted the ingratitude of those whom he had benefited as part of the day's work. He fully understood and appreciated the true nature of the service which he had rendered to his country. And he knew (as we ourselves know to-day) that it was his shrewd brain which had bestowed upon the thirteen quarreling little colonies that common declaration of faith which in the eyes of the rest of the world lifted the Americans out of the class of mere "rebels"and put them foremost into the ranks of those who since time immemorial had fought for the right of man to decide his own political allegiance.

The members of the first Continental Congress had still talked a great deal about "loyalty." The few radicals who had fore-seen that a breach with the mother country was inevitable had not been able to convince their more conservative neighbors. Since then a great deal of water had flowed through the Schuylkill. The English had been defeated in the first encounter with the patriots. But the breach between "city" and "country" was wider than ever before and in several of the provinces there was the prospect of a civic rebellion or even worse, an outbreak of anarchy.

Under those circumstances it was felt that only a very drastic measure as the overthrow of the old form of government and the proclamation of independent republic could really bring all the contending factions together. Such a bold step would make the breach with the mother country definite and irreparable and it would give new courage to the half-hearted and the lukewarm by offering them their choice between a noble death on the field of a battle or an ignominious demise on the gallows of His Majesty.

On the seventh of June of the year 1776 Richard Henry Lee (born in the same Virginia county as Washington, after prolonged consultations with the political leaders in his own colony, offered the following resolution:

 in the first place, that "these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states, that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved":

in the second place, that “it is expedient to take the most effectual measures for forming political alliances":

and in the third place, that "a plan of confederation be prepared and transmitted to the respective colonies for their consideration and approbation." John Adams of Massachusetts seconded the motion and a committee was appointed to draft a formal document which should explain to the people at home and to the world at large exactly in what manner and by what exasperating means the King of England had forced his erstwhile loyal subjects to take such a drastic step and sever all connections with the mother country.

This famous committee consisted of Benjamin Franklin, Roger Sherman, Robert R. Livingston, John Adams and Thomas Jefferson.

Sherman and Livingston had been elected to gain the goodwill of New York (a colony rightly suspected of strong loyalist tendencies) and they did not take a very important part in the preliminary discussions. Franklin and Adams made a few suggestions which slightly modified the inner structure of half a dozen sentences. The Declaration of Independence, therefore, as it stands to this day, was the work of Thomas Jefferson and embodied not only his political convictions but his general philosophy of life as well.

Jefferson, in contrast with Washington, had read widely. Few authors had made such a deep impression upon him as John Locke, the contemporary of Spinoza and one of the earliest champions in England of the new and starting principle that man was entitled to his own convictions. Where Locke first go this notion we do not know. But during the latter half of the seventeenth century he declared their independence from Spain in a document which had stated that all sovereigns have been appointed by God that they may rule their subjects as shepherds who watch over their flocks," and further-more, that the subjects have not been created for the benefit of the king, but the king has been created for the benefit of the subjects."

Jefferson, in his Declaration of Independence, followed the method used by his Dutch predecessors. First of all he explained his general ideas concerning the theory of life and of government. Next he enumerated the grievous injuries which His Majesty King George I (vice Philip II had inflicted upon his longsuffering subjects, the people of the United States of America (vice the people of the United Netherlands). Then he summed up with the verdict that the aforementioned subjects had been left with no other mode

of redress than to declare themselves independent.

The Declaration was duly read and discussed in the Continental Congress, a few slight changes were proposed and all this toff so much time that the committee did not get ready with the final draft of the document until the evening of the fourth of July. On the fifth of July a few copies were printed and were sent to the commanding officers of the revolutionary forces. Finally on the eighth the Declaration was in such shape that it could be read to the people of Philadelphia who for that purpose had come together in City Hall Square.

On the nineteenth of July (due to slow work on the part of the New York delegation) it was decided to have the Declaration written down on a large sheet of parchment.

On the second of August, the official scribe got through with his task and then at last the work of affixing the signatures could begin. Of those whose names appeared at the end of this extraordinary document, eight had been bom outside of the colonies and eighteen were of foreign origin. The other half could claim descent from English ancestors.

So did our nation on the day of its birth truly represent that ideal of a common brotherhood of man which the hardships of life in the wilderness had forced upon the disinherited masses of the alder world.

译文：

第25章

托马斯·杰斐逊证明传统教育的优越性

大概五、六十年前，中世纪通常被视为盛大集会、公主落难、圣人和刑具的五彩斑斓的时代，宛如一幕时长近千年的戏剧。

然而在中世纪别致危险的废墟之下，现代史学家对看似乏味的故纸堆进行了细致的研究。现在我们明白，8世纪、12世纪和14世纪的男男女女和现代人并无二致。那些看似惊人的差异名不副实。衣着锁子甲和天鹅绒外套的祖先们和我们同样有着无法遏制的生存欲望。

在此，我们可以对已有的观点进行修正的领域之一就是建筑。

我们的先辈们这样点评中世纪的要塞：“那些高墙巨塔很有意思。建造它们的目的当然是为了保护市民，抵御他们的敌人、巨寇和国王们”。

今天我们知道这只是部分的真相。中世纪的防御体系目的有二：御敌于外，囿民于内。

沃尔特·司各特爵士小说中有关荣誉决斗和围城之战的精彩场景，在当时普通人看来则无比凄凉。

中世纪的人们并不了解什么是民族主义。他们的忠诚属于自己的家庭，很少从民族和国家的角度思考问题。他们看待皇帝和国王，就如同我们看待诸多并不喜欢但已然根深蒂固的制度一般。

当法国国王与西班牙国王交战时，法国国王的军队自然应该去围困西班牙国王的要塞，西班牙军队反之亦然；法国国王要塞的守军应能为远在巴黎的君主效力而全力死守，西班牙国王要塞的守军也被期望能够守护城堡免于瓦卢瓦王朝雇佣军的染指。

与此同时，惶恐不安的可怜市民只能默默承受、忍饥挨饿，直到战争结束。他们要么遭受获胜敌军的劫掠，要么被迫向英勇的守卫者贡献大笔财富。不管结果怎样，他们的生活都会被毁掉。

我无意隐瞒真相。当市民们被逼到捕食老鼠为生以证明对君主的忠诚时，他们宁可打开城门对交战的双方疾呼：“你们想做什么都可以，但看在老天的份上结束这愚蠢的杀戮，让我们回归正轨吧”。

守军自然有义务阻止此种叛逆行为。因此，如前所述，中世纪的堡垒有两种目的，能让守军能将枪口对准敌人以及自己人。

美国的革命者们类似堡垒的守军。他们不仅要抵御英国人，同时还要防范亲英派与英国人串通合作。

革命过去很久之后，我们倾向于忘记效忠于英王的人数实际上非常之大。革命的麻烦制造者们几乎都属于富裕阶层，这也成为他们覆灭的原因。很早以前他们就是专业放贷者，因此长期以来招致小农户深深的憎恶。当小农户参加独立军之后终于有机会进行清算。他们在公开场合大声宣布任何“叛徒”的命运，亲英派只得被迫保持沉默。如果美国战败，很难说他们会做什么。但起义军守住了自己的城池，亲英派从未得逞。

英国人的问题没有那么容易得到解决。根据伦敦的最新报告，英国政府在雇用所有能找到的大陆雇佣军以图镇压殖民地。但英国人的这一攻势并没有给华盛顿及其部下增加太多困扰。他们见过太多的英国职业军官，对英国并不畏惧。此外，他们更熟悉自己的国家，熟悉野战技巧，同时离己方补给基地更近。没错，对抗英王陛下笨拙的德国农民雇佣军对他们来说确是波澜不惊。

然而，真正让他们感到焦虑的问题是：看似动员整个国家的激情能否持续到最后？军民之间的团结能否坚持到敌人被击败的那一天？

这一切迟早将见分晓，不仅关乎是英国人还是美国人将统治大西洋沿岸这些肥沃的土地，也在于新的国家中对立的双方谁将成为主导的力量——城市的贵族、商人和放贷者，还是边疆的民主派、农民和小店主？

现在，敌人兵临城下，胜利的关键在于通力合作。为了使合作得以开展，必须搭建一个双方可以团结一致的平台，哪怕是临时的，哪怕维持几个月或几年。

华盛顿正忙于训练新兵而无暇他顾。约翰·亚当斯缺少那种个人魅力和说服力，从而无法凝聚众人，正如在威廉·潘的古都[[1]](#footnote-0)进行的第二次会议所展示的那样。又一次，一位弗吉尼亚人成为了救星。

托马斯·杰斐逊和华盛顿一样都是南方人。他同样来自于这块土地上最上等的家族之一，因为他的父亲娶了一名伦道夫家族的女子。但两人之间并没有可比性。华盛顿无论出身还是背景都是一名“贵族”——他是少数早先占据低地丰饶土地的农场主的一员。而杰斐逊是一名真正的边疆的孩子，童年在遥远的蓝岭山脉度过，成长于农人之间，直到上大学之前很少接触东部的文明。他的大学是荷兰摄政威廉和他的英国王后于1693年在威廉斯堡建立的[[2]](#footnote-1)。

16世纪早期伟大的人文主义者伊拉斯谟说，他喜欢天主教的生活方式与路德宗的思考方式。与此类似，可以说杰斐逊喜欢贵族的思考方式与民主的生活方式。

而正与英军血战的华盛顿却很乐意被人尊称为阁下，喜欢参加浮华的盛会。在他很多敌人的眼里，所有爱国者应该从心底里厌恶他的这些王族做派。

杰斐逊则完全相反。早在童年时代，在阿尔伯马尔郡的邻居眼里，杰斐逊朴实无华。他十分反感那些生活中那些在边疆硬汉看起来矫揉造作的贵族做派。然而，独立的心灵多见于那些不为衣食发愁的人。在这一点上，杰斐逊是贵族中的贵族。

革命的创造者是来自贫民窟的受压迫的贫民，这是一个常见的误会。那些贫困且营养不良的老百姓只是次要角色，只有在需要的时候才被当做炮灰派上战场。真正左右局面的人有着不同的身份。真正舍弃舒适的生活，甘冒风险为理想而献身的激进贵族当中，杰斐逊是最为杰出的代表。

和华盛顿一样，杰斐逊也承受着人们对其误解所带来的痛苦。和华盛顿一样，他忍受过后人难以想象的嫉妒、中伤、诽谤和羞辱。和华盛顿（以及所有真正的伟人）一样，他接受了人们的忘恩负义，却依然保持初心。他深刻理解为国家尽到责任的真谛。而且他知道（如我们今天所知道的那样），是他精明的头脑为十三个争吵不休的小殖民地设计出一个共同的信仰宣言，从而为美国人摆脱了世人眼中的“叛乱者”的标签，为他们首先争取到了长久以来所奋斗的当家做主的权利。

第一届大陆会议的成员仍然花了很长时间讨论“忠诚”。少数预见与母国的分道扬镳不可避免的激进派很难说服他们更为保守的邻居。之后斯古吉尔河的水量变得更大。英国人在与爱国者的第一次交锋中败下阵来。但“城市”和“乡下”的裂痕变得更大，在很多地方有市民暴动的迹象，甚至糟糕到要陷入无政府状态。

在这种环境下，只有采取如抛弃旧政府、宣布成立独立共和国的非常手段才能消除派系之间的争斗。这一大胆举动将导致和母国的裂痕不可避免，也可以给半心半意和不冷不热的人以新的勇气，让他们选择或者光荣的战死沙场，或者在英王的威压下可耻的屈服。

1776年6月7日，理查德·亨利·李（和华盛顿出生在弗吉尼亚的同一个郡）在和殖民地政治领袖进行漫长的协商后，提出了以下决议：

第一、“各联合殖民地基于应有的权利，为自由而独立的国家，废除对英国王室的效忠，同时完全且理应取消与英国所有的政治联系”。

第二、“采取最有效的方式建立政治联盟是权宜之计”。

第三、“筹备邦联的计划提交各殖民地讨论并批准”。

马萨诸塞的约翰·亚当斯表示附议，成立一个委员会来起草正式的文件，向国内以及全世界说明，英王的恶行是如何引发天怒人怨，把原本忠于他的臣民逼迫到不得以采取这种激烈的手段，切断与母国的一切关系。

这个著名的委员会包括本杰明·富兰克林、罗杰·谢尔曼、罗伯特·R. 利文斯顿、约翰·亚当斯和托马斯·杰斐逊。

谢尔曼和利文斯顿进入委员会是为了争取纽约（有强烈的效忠英王的倾向）的支持，两人在初稿讨论中并没有发挥什么作用。富兰克林和亚当斯提出了些许建议，对几个句子的结构进行了微调。因此，流传至今的《独立宣言》主要出于托马斯·杰斐逊之手，不仅展示了他的政治信仰，也表达了他对生命的基本理念。

与华盛顿不同，杰斐逊博览群书。很少有人能像约翰·洛克那样给他留下如何深刻的印象。洛克是斯宾诺莎的同代人，也是最早在英国提出“人有权决定自己信仰”这一惊人新观点的人。我们不知道洛克一开始是从哪里获得这一观点的。但在17世纪后期他流亡荷兰，此时距离这个国家摆脱西班牙统治已经100年了。荷兰在独立的文件中宣布：“所有君主都是上帝所任命的，像牧羊人看管羊群一样统治自己的臣民。臣民的产生不是为了君主的利益，但君主的产生是为了造福臣民”。

杰斐逊在《独立宣言》中沿用了荷兰先驱者们使用的方法。首先，他阐释了生命与政府理论的一般思想。接着，他列举了英王乔治三世（以替代腓力二世[[3]](#footnote-2)）给长期遭受迫害的臣民，即美利坚合众国人民（以替代尼德兰联合省人民）所造成的苦难。接着他总结道，上述臣民别无选择，唯有宣布独立。

大陆会议对宣言进行了充分的讨论，对一些细微之处提出了修改意见，这一切又花费了很长的时间。直到7月4日晚上，委员会尚未完成最后一稿的修改。7月5日，几份复本被打印出来并送到革命军各指挥官的手中。最后在7月8日，宣言终于成形，可以面向为此而汇聚到到市政厅广场的费城民众进行宣读。

直到7月9日（因为纽约代表团工作进展缓慢），才决定将宣言抄写在一大张羊皮纸上。

到8月2日抄写员完成了他的工作的时候，签名的工作方可进行。在这份杰出的文件上签名的人当中，8名出生于殖民地以外的地方，18名有外国血统。其余半数可以说是英格兰人的后裔。

自那一天我们的国家诞生以来，就真正体现了四海之内皆兄弟的理想。这种理想通过拓荒的艰难生活施加在来自旧大陆且一无所有的人身上。

1. 即费城。1682年，英国探险家威廉·潘发现并命名。1774-1775年间两次大陆会议在此召开并通过《独立宣言》。在华盛顿特区建市之前为美国首都。——译者注 [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. 威廉与玛丽学院，是美国历史第二悠久的高等学府，仅次于哈佛大学，是美国第一所学院（college），常青藤名校之一。——译者注 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. 腓力二世，西班牙国王，对尼德兰各省进行铁腕统治。——译者注 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)