
Maximilien de Robespierre’s (1758–1794) career would not have been possible without the French Revolution. A provincial lawyer, he took advantage of the Revolution’s emphasis on merit over birth, rising to become the leader of the government. He also led the Terror (September 1793–July 1794), a period when the French Revolution became increasingly radical. France was facing down military incursions from other European monarchs and from internal opponents of the Revolution. During this time, a small group of revolutionaries, led by Robespierre, took control of government and attempted to purge France of people whom they considered dangerous to the goals of the Revolution.

This was a time of great fear in France, when people were executed for even the suspicion of disloyalty. Ultimately, France was victorious in external wars, but Robespierre continued the Terror. Eventually Robespierre himself was consumed by the Terror he had helped to create, facing execution by guillotine in 1794. Robespierre’s death marked the end of the Terror.


But, to found and consolidate democracy, to achieve the peaceable reign of the constitutional laws, we must end the war of liberty against tyranny and pass safely across the storms of the revolution: such is the aim of the revolutionary system that you have enacted. Your conduct, then, ought also to be regulated by the stormy circumstances in which the republic is placed; and the plan of your administration must result from the
spirit of the revolutionary government combined with the general principles of democracy.

Now, what is the fundamental principle of the democratic or popular government—that is, the essential spring which makes it move? It is virtue; I am speaking of the public virtue which affected so many prodigies in Greece and Rome and which ought to produce much more surprising ones in republican France; of that virtue which is nothing other than the love of country and of its laws.

But as the essence of the republic or of democracy is equality, it follows that the love of country necessarily includes the love of equality.

It is also true that this sublime sentiment assumes a preference for the public interest over every particular interest; hence the love of country presupposes or produces all the virtues: for what are they other than that spiritual strength which renders one capable of those sacrifices? And how could the slave of avarice or ambition, for example, sacrifice his idol to his country?

Not only is virtue the soul of democracy; it can exist only in that government…

Republican virtue can be considered in relation to the people and in relation to the government; it is necessary in both. When only the government lacks virtue, there remains a resource in the people’s virtue; but when the people itself is corrupted, liberty is already lost.

Fortunately virtue is natural to the people, notwithstanding aristocratic prejudices. A nation is truly corrupted when, having by degrees lost its character and its liberty, it
passes from democracy to aristocracy or to monarchy; that is the decrepitude and death of the body politic. …

But when, by prodigious efforts of courage and reason, a people breaks the chains of despotism to make them into trophies of liberty; when by the force of its moral temperament it comes, as it were, out of the arms of the death, to recapture all the vigor of youth; when by turns it is sensitive and proud, intrepid and docile, and can be stopped neither by impregnable ramparts nor by the innumerable armies of the tyrants armed against it, but stops of itself upon confronting the law’s image; then if it does not climb rapidly to the summit of its destinies, this can only be the fault of those who govern it.

From all this let us deduce a great truth: the characteristic of popular government is confidence in the people and severity towards itself.

The whole development of our theory would end here if you had only to pilot the vessel of the Republic through calm waters; but the tempest roars, and the revolution imposes on you another task.

This great purity of the French revolution’s basis, the very sublimity of its objective, is precisely what causes both our strength and our weakness. Our strength, because it gives to us truth’s ascendancy over imposture, and the rights of the public interest over private interests; our weakness, because it rallies all vicious men against us, all those who in their hearts contemplated despoiling the people and all those who intend to let it be despoiled with impunity, both those who have rejected freedom as a personal calamity and those who have embraced the revolution as a career and the Republic as prey. Hence the defection of so many ambitious or greedy men who since the point of
departure have abandoned us along the way because they did not begin the journey with
the same destination in view. The two opposing spirits that have been represented in a
struggle to rule nature might be said to be fighting in this great period of human history to
fix irrevocably the world’s destinies, and France is the scene of this fearful combat.
Without, all the tyrants encircle you; within, all tyranny’s friends conspire; they will
conspire until hope is wrested from crime. We must smother the internal and external
enemies of the Republic or perish with it; now in this situation, the first maxim of your
policy ought to be to lead the people by reason and the people’s enemies by terror.

If the spring of popular government in time of peace is virtue, the springs of
popular government in revolution are at once virtue and terror: virtue, without which
terror is fatal; terror, without which virtue is powerless. Terror is nothing other than
justice, prompt, severe, inflexible; it is therefore an emanation of virtue; it is not so much
a special principle as it is a consequence of the general principle of democracy applied to
our country’s most urgent needs.

It has been said that terror is the principle of despotic government. Does your
government therefore resemble despotism? Yes, as the sword that gleams in the hands of
the heroes of liberty resembles that with which the henchmen of tyranny are armed. Let
the despot govern by terror his brutalized subjects; he is right, as a despot. Subdue by
terror the enemies of liberty, and you will be right, as founders of the Republic. The
government of the revolution is liberty’s despotism against tyranny. Is force made only to
protect crime? And is the thunderbolt not destined to strike the heads of the proud?
Indulgence for the royalists, cry certain men, mercy for the villains! No! mercy for the innocent, mercy for the weak, mercy for the unfortunate, mercy for humanity.

Society owes protection only to peaceable citizens; the only citizens in the Republic are the republicans. For it, the royalists, the conspirators are only strangers or, rather, enemies. This terrible war waged by liberty against tyranny—is it not indivisible? Are the enemies within not the allies of the enemies without? The assassins who tear our country apart, the intriguers who buy the consciences that hold the people’s mandate; the traitors who sell them; the mercenary pamphleteers hired to dishonor the people’s cause, to kill public virtue, to stir up the fire of civil discord, and to prepare political counterrevolution by moral counterrevolution—are all those men less guilty or less dangerous than the tyrants whom they serve?

QUESTIONS

1. In what ways does Robespierre view the violence of the Terror as part of the Enlightenment’s legacy?

2. What is the role of virtue in a government? How does it shift in times of war and peace?

3. For Robespierre, why is the Terror necessary?