Hello and welcome history friends patrons all to the 29th episode of the PHM. Last time we examined the tense and weighted days of Stanislav’ early moments as the King of Poland; where he was brought into Warsaw under the cloak of secrecy to a population on the verge of doing something defiant. Apparently in the right place at the right time to take advantage of this spirit, arguably encapsulated in the Primate of Poland, Theodore Potocky, and his allies, Stanislav’ began his second reign as King of Poland with high spirits, but these were soon dashed. Expecting Russian resistance to his election, Stan withdrew to Gdansk to better defend his position, in anticipation of the French reinforcements which were to come by sea. Instead all he got was a rash, hopeless noble and tragically naïve French ambassador to Denmark, who threw his life away in a pointless charge at the Russian positions in the hope that this would save French honour or inspire Louis XV to intervene in his father in law’s name. It did not. Louis’ attentions were pulled rapidly away from any Polish questions when it was learned that neither Austria nor Russia would accept Stanislav’ candidacy.

Perhaps unwilling all along to approve the scheme, Cardinal Fleury eagerly advocated the abandonment of the Polish venture to his sovereign, who always respected his elderly Cardinal’s advice. Such an argument proved easy to make because, as we’ll see in the next episode, France had bigger fish to fry, and indeed was experiencing more tangible success, in other European theatres. So it was that King Stanislav, abandoned by his son in law to the great mortification of his daughter, withdrew first into a Prussian exile, and then back to France as per a truce made with the HR Emperor in October 1735. In this episode, we bypass the war and the un-Polish conflict it had become, in favour of something more inspiring, if unfortunate and sad – the story of King Stanislav Lechynski’s life, in a French exile.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

To my dear Primate and the Polish Lords My grief in separating from you, my dear and true friends, speaks sufficiently to give you a sense of all I feel in this cruel moment. The forced resolution I take is founded only on the in-utility of my sacrifice, as you yourselves have so judged. I embrace you all very tenderly, beginning with my Lord the Primate; and I beseech you by yourselves, and consequently by what is most dear to me, to unite more than ever for supporting, as much as possible, the interests of my dear country, which has no support but in you alone. The tears which spread upon the words I write oblige me to stop. May you at least read in the bottom of my heart the sentiments which your love for 'me has fixed and graved in it forever. I am, from my heart and soul, King Stanislav.[[1]](#footnote-1)

These were the words spoken by Stanislav Lechynski in his abdication letter, on 26th January 1736. In the months and years before that date, Stanislav’ life had been one of constant wrenching disappointment; repeatedly he had been given hope that Louis XV of France might come through for him, and repeatedly he had been let down. The interests and aid of France had evidently been turned elsewhere at the very moment when those same interests and that same aid had landed Stanislav in an impossible situation – in a Polish sea without an allied paddle. Devoid of friends or allies, Stanislav had been forced to depend on weak promises from sympathetic persons, all of whom knew that deep down, without French initiatives, the cause was hopeless. It would have been a bitter blow for the son of Polish commercial magnates, born in Lwow in 1677 to a thoroughly patriotic Polish family, whose grandfather would fight valiantly outside the walls of Vienna. The valiant service Stanislav’ maternal grandfather lent to his homeland came despite the fact that by that point, Stanislav’ grandfather, after whom he had been named – a wiry individual by the name of Stanislav Jan Jablonowski – was entering his 60th year.

The family thus had a storied history of honourable service to the Commonwealth, and even while Stanislav’ election in 1704 came under circumstances which were far from ideal, this new King was determined to make the best of a bad situation. We often forget that the GNW was a conflict largely begun by Augustus II’s initiative as elector of Saxony, and that the Commonwealth was merely a disinterested bystander, pulled into the affair when Augustus brought his ambitions to the new kingdom which he cared little for. Content to divide its lands up to pay for his schemes, neither Augustus II nor Augustus III operated without some kind of motive at heart; rarely, at the core of their actions, could the direct interests of the PLC be found. Stanislav believed that his nationality and proclivities towards wanting the best for his countrymen singled him out as better than these foreign kings, and many of his countrymen could be found to agree with him.

Waging a personal war of sorts against the Saxon House of Wettin, Stanislav’ story is certainly a unique one. Living long enough to challenge both the father and the son, Stanislav would live to see the deaths of both men, and upon each of their deaths be given further evidence of the unsuitability of foreign monarchs to the Commonwealth’s constitution. This was not a self-interested belief – he did not believe for example that no candidate other than himself would do; nor was the claim to have the interests of all Poles, Lithuanians and whoever else at heart merely an act to commend him to his people. To the end of his life Stanislav remained a committed and patriotic nationalist for his people and a caring, active exile. He wrote consistently and intelligently on a range of subjects regarding the fortunes of his homeland, how to fix its woes and precisely what had caused them.

Until his death in 1766, he was also the Duke of Lorraine, a compromise reached at the end of the WPS which was designed to both compensate Stanislav and ensure that that troublesome Duchy finally reverted to the King of France at last. As per a term of that treaty, Stanislav was granted little practical powers to do anything in Lorraine, and the assumption went that he would idle away his remaining years in comfortable obscurity. Yet Stanislav was anything but a willing puppet of France during his tenure as Duke; he was more than willing to speak for his adopted people and to impress upon his unimpressed son in law the extent of their needs. One imagines that, having seen what kind of impression foreign Kings made on his own homeland, he didn’t want to be the Augustus II or Augustus III to the people of Lorraine. He seems to have succeeded by some measure, since Stan was granted the title Stanislav the Beneficent by the Duchy’s citizens, which of course pleased him greatly.[[2]](#footnote-2) Granted this duchy for the rest of his life, he was determined to make a good go of it, and from this position he would launch many a pamphlet, observation or weighted letter to his noble or even royal European peers, ensuring in the process that the status of the PLC and above all its people remained unforgotten.

We know of course that Stanislav was fighting a losing battle in this regard, because by the time he left Gdansk in late June 1734, Europe had already forgotten about Poland, and was focusing instead on more ‘important’ matters. Stanislav is not the last tragic figure that the story of Poland in the 18th century will produce, but he is one of the most memorable because, even at the early stage of the decline, Stanislav could already see what was about to come. The pieces he wrote were not simply vain protests against the unfairness of Augustus’ reign or of how much a better king he would have been than the Saxons – they were tracts with real utility and value, and he genuinely hoped that his countrymen both at home or in exile would gain some measure of solace from them. We can of course ask why, if a pragmatic man like Stanislav appreciated the situation of the Commonwealth, and held out little hope if any for his own *third* restoration as King, then why did he keep on writing so many works? The point one historian makes is that it was in Stanislav’ blood as much as it was in his creed to never cease working to bring hope to his people or education to his peers. The alternative was idleness, which Stanislav would never and could never abide by, believing it imperative that he made use of his privileged position to get his important message across. The rest of this episode will do its best to untangle these messages, so if you’re ready, let’s begin.

One of the most notable tracts Stanislav wrote was penned upon his second abdication in January 1736. Although a bitter blow which affected him greatly, Stanislav took the time to write to the people of Poland as we saw, but he also took the time to give credit and thanks to the other servant of his during the terrible years – the city of Gdansk itself, which had loyally attempted to defend him and his ambitions up to June 1734 even while everyone else had abandoned him. Writing no doubt with a nostalgia for what might have been, Stan wrote that:

To my good City of Danzig I depart when I can no longer remain with you, nor enjoy longer the testimonies of so unexampled a love and fidelity. I retain, with the regret for your sufferings, the grateful acknowledgments which I owe you, and of which I shall acquit myself at all times by all the means that may convince you of them. I wish you all the happiness you de serve; it will be my consolation amidst the distress that forces me from you. I am, and shall be always and everywhere, your most affectionate King Stanislav.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Such a letter wasn’t necessary or the done thing for monarchs to do, yet Stanislav did it, he went against protocol, apologised to the city which had defended him against his enemies, and acknowledged that its citizens had suffered for him. At the same time, there was little Stan could now but give them his heartfelt appreciation. Determined to justify the faith that the people of Gdansk had placed in him, a further motivating factor for Stanislav at least in his earlier years as a guest of Lorraine was to demonstrate his worth – that he had been worth saving, and that the citizens of Gdansk had done the right thing by saving him rather than handing him over to the Russians, who certainly would have paid them all a high price. Stanislav knew that his lodgings would likely be very different had he come into the hands of his enemies, and that the stance of Gdansk was far from certain considering the apathetic or paralysed state that the rest of the Commonwealth had been in.

To show that he was worth their sacrifice, Stanislav endeavoured to work tirelessly in the name of the people of Gdansk as much as the wider Commonwealth; those that had tried to fight for him but had been overwhelmed, such as the Primate of Poland’s brother, who had attempted to rally 10k men around Cracow only to eventually be cut down. The Commonwealth was plainly in a time of great peril, with his well-meaning institutions having been turned against her, and her neighbours taking every advantage. What Poland needed was to believe that it was not yet lost; it needed to read about possible solutions, be informed of the relevant parties and issues at stake and understand that hope existed still. First of all, she needed an army, and considering the unimpressive military response of the Commonwealth during his time of need, even despite the fact that so many nobles had voted for him, Stan knew that he couldn’t fully rely on his countrymen in Poland to create that army for its own sake. Surrounded by better organised and better equipped neighbours, Stanislav appreciated with some bitterness that there was no question of his homeland now fighting back against Russia or the Habsburgs for the sake of its independence. On 1st May 1737, Stanislav opened a military cadet’s school in Luneville, a direct predecessor to the Warsaw Military Academy which opened its doors in 1765, largely because Stanislav’ looming death threatened the closure of the Luneville institution.

Too many different families were involved in schemes external to the more straightforward question of Polish independence; through bribery, coercion or both, several Polish families had become useful tools of the Russians. Others had become disenchanted with the Commonwealth’s manipulated political system, and in the face of yet another civil war over the Polish Crown as there had been in 1733, just like at Augustus II’s election in 1698, and of course in the intervening years as the Swedes and Russians laid their own claimants through 1700-1710, many simply distanced themselves from either party and withdrew into their estates. Determined to choose the path of least resistance for the sake of their family’s fortunes, and tiring of the bloodshed at the same time, these individuals were the product of a Commonwealth which had seen its political systems manifestly fail just at the time when it was plunged into a succession of wars. From 1648-1720, the Commonwealth never enjoyed more than five years of successive peace, and the decade following this had been shattered by the recent war over the Polish Crown.

It is difficult to overstate how beleaguered and demoralised the nobles would have felt by the time the WPS broke out; it is easy for us to look down on the Commonwealth, to see its peoples as easily dominated or intimidated by stronger neighbours, or foolishly overcome by mere bribes or manipulation, but it is critical for the sake of this podcast that we do not forget the context of the 18th century. The Commonwealth was and had become a very dark place to live in by the 1730s, and the Stanislav’ mission was to bring some light into this darkness, to use his profile to draw attention to the country’s history, to its proud legacy and valuable institutions, and of course to the glaring dangers to these same assets which had recently become so rampant. To provide a solution to such woes, Stanislav wrote his largest tome yet in 1737: a compilation of the "Glos wolny," or free voice, although it was not published until 1749 when it appeared simultaneously in Polish and in French. Its name in France was elaborated to The Free Voice of the Citizen or Observations on the Government of Poland, which basically prepared the reader exactly for what they were getting themselves in for if they decided to pick one up.

When it started to enter the recommended reading of the beleaguered, frustrated or reforming Commonwealth nobles in the early 1750s, its messages and pieces of advice struck a chord. In the years before and leading up to the 1730s, a series of pamphlets in the Commonwealth were released criticising the liberum veto and explaining why it had to be done away with, or at least heavily reformed. Then, additional writers in favour of the veto criticised those authors as attempting to limit the so-called golden freedoms of the Commonwealth nobility, to which the authors responded that these golden freedoms were forcing the nobility of Poland into a corner which was very much unfree, to which the conservatively minded nobles said they didn’t see things that way. The whole through the 18th century, in the background of our narrative when the main events like the GNW or the WPS occur, the tension between desiring the golden freedoms and seeing them as weakening the Commonwealth was brought to the fore. It wasn’t until the very end of the century, when in 1791 a revolutionary new constitution was passed, that the nobility of the Commonwealth decided they preferred majority to unanimity, but for now, the fear and jealousy surrounding suggestions to abolish the liberum veto sent absolutist shockwaves down many nobles’ spines. Stanislav was to write against this trend, and he did his best.

In his brilliantly quotable book *free voice*, Stan sets out his own beliefs on what has befallen his country in the preface, noting:

I know that it is vain to try to make the voice of reason prevail among those who recognize nothing but their own will, and who cannot profit by misfortune only too often experienced; that it is not easy to give stability to the most beneficial laws when it is permitted to violate them with impunity…to establish order in a Kingdom which believes it is sustained only by trouble and confusion; and finally to provide means of salvation for a State where freedom is made to consist in the power to ruin one's self.

Stanislav warns that while collapse can appear imminent in the turbulent Polish political system, it is not inevitable, adding that:

…we do not lack excellent workers; I only wish to have put to use all the precious materials which Providence has given us so abundantly. Indeed nothing is wanting to all that can contribute to the welfare and prosperity of our Kingdom. Our nation is incontestably full of valour, endowed with wit, manners, sensibility, a fund of Religion, of courage, of generosity, not commonly found among other peoples; and everything seems to unite for ennobling the heart, the great example of our ancestors, the admirable statutes they drew up, the vast realm they left us; our very freedom would in itself suffice to inspire in us that lofty ambition, so becoming to noble souls, which can accomplish anything; if instead of willing only what is pleasing to us we would apply ourselves to will only what is most salutary for us.

Stanislav continues by reasoning that the turmoil of the last few decades had utterly ruined the original harmony between the king’s power and the freedom of the subjects, writing:

That right order, so salutary, no longer exists; that just balance is unknown among us. The royal power strives unceasingly against free dom in order to destroy it, and freedom seeks to shake off the yoke of royal power which constrains it; a sorry incompatibility, scarcely to be avoided in a government at once Monarchy and Democracy, of which the ordinary consequences are divisions, confederations, internal strife; where force overwhelms justice, where often justice itself is to be feared because of the violence used to maintain it.

In a surprising move considering his readership, Stan decided not to condemn the greedy kings of the last few decades, but instead to lay the blame at the feet of those nobles and citizens who used the difficulties of the Commonwealth to gain some advantage for themselves at its expense. He noted:

Our impetuous freedom seems rather like a torrent which cannot be stopped in its course; but we have three dams to control it: conscience, which leads us to union through love of our neighbour; reason, which demands order were it only for our own preservation; and finally our Laws, which cannot be violated without destroying freedom.

Stanislav spends much time dwelling on the importance of Christianity or more precisely Catholicism to the Polish identity and indeed to the message of freedom central to the constitution. He noted the necessity of being a Christian to being a good citizen when he wrote:

It is not for me to recommend respect and veneration for Religion in a Kingdom where, by the grace of God, the Word of the Gospel is the Law of the State; but I may be permitted to say that all our temporal concerns must be in harmony with that Law alone as the unique support of Civil Society, even more imperative in a Republican State than in a Monarchy. A king may control his subjects by the mere weight of his authority; but where freedom rules, the principles of Religion alone are capable of restraining, and they can more readily prevent or put down revolutions than can rigor of Law or love of Country. Religion also teaches the proper limits of freedom: Let us value freedom as a precious gift of God. He gave man free will at the moment of creation; but at the same time prescribed laws that he might not abuse this gift and turn to his own destruction the very means destined for his salvation.[[4]](#footnote-4)

However we might feel about such views, to the likes of Stanislav and his peers, religion was a central part of their daily lives and of their identities as Polish or Lithuanian or other nobles. We have talked much about the sense of national identity in the Commonwealth, and how many Poles believed their ancestors were the Sarmatians from north of the Black Sea, who stampeded across Europe and settled in the modern-day countries of Poland, Belarus etc. Considering their position as being on the crossroads of Europe, it shouldn’t surprise us to note that Poles took their cue from the travelling and migrating peoples of old, and regardless of the accuracy behind this claim, and it is not necessarily a complete falsehood, it remained an integral part the identity of the nobles. It affected how they saw themselves, how they dressed and even what weapons they used. Tied in with a zeal for Catholicism, you pretty much have the identity tags of most Commonwealth noblemen of the period; to emphasise and have pride in your inner Sarmatian was to embrace all that was inherently Polish. Identifying as the most eastern Catholic nation only added to this mystique. I would be very interested if any lovely Polish listeners, or those living in lands once under the Commonwealth such as Lithuania, could let me know the extent to which Sarmatia still lingers on. I have heard that it is viewed with some sense of irony in Poland, while in Lithuania to be ‘Sarmatian’ is to be proud, in a good way, but I could be wrong! Let me know either way through the usual channels.

These bits of background are important, because after the woes afflicting the Commonwealth and the problems which had warped its honourable constitution, Stan turned bravely to the next most important identifying aspect of the Commonwealth noble’s character after his religion and national ancestry – his political freedom. Stanislav was about to bravely weigh in on how he felt about the liberum veto, but before he did so, he guarded himself by saying:

God forbid that in touching on so delicate a subject as the Liberum veto I should attack this august prerogative of our freedom. I maintain only that it must be used in such a way as not to injure the Republic, as it has done only too often.

Too often indeed. Stanislav knew first-hand how many Sejms, potentially valuable bills and necessary reforms had been shot down with a simple ‘I object’. The liberum veto remains one of the most striking and unusual aspects of the early modern political systems of Europe; almost too ridiculous to be true. Yet it was true, and the liberum veto did exist, out of the political ideology which upheld that unanimous decisions were superior to majority decisions, and that if no unanimity was possible, no decision was better. Having seen where such attitudes had taken the Commonwealth by the time he had finished the tome in 1737, Stanislav both appreciated the nobles’ concern for their freedoms and understood that if any progress was to be made, the Commonwealth’s political system would have to be changed from the ground up, starting with the liberum veto. We aren’t going to dwell too long on the topic of the liberum veto, since we have an episode released earlier in the timeline especially for the purpose of examining that device, but it is worth looking at what a former King thought of it.

Stanislav wrote:

Far from destroying the Liberum veto, I would defend and sustain it…we must have regard for the way in which it is permitted to use these rights, and not exercise them indiscriminately without rule or regulation. Certainly, in matters presented for deliberation, we may use the Liberum veto; it is fitting that it should then have all its force, for there is its true end, so to speak; with this purpose it was established, and it would be to degrade ourselves, often even to betray the Republic, to neglect this privilege when on critical occasions honour and conscience bid us have recourse to it; then it is sufficient to contradict an equivocal project to open the eyes of all the Assembly, or at least to force them not to carry it through. It is not so in matters already approved by the State; here no opposition can or should arise, since only the Republic can annul what she herself has done. Would it be natural if one among us, unwilling to submit to some one of our laws, had the power to abrogate it and perpetuate among us all the abuses it was aimed to destroy? The Liberum veto, that right so worthy of our respect, was not given to us with that intention: and still less should we extend it to dissolution of our Diets by these pernicious and abusive words…This is the height of outrage to freedom. What will become of her, our republic or, indeed, this freedom which we ought to defend at risk of life, if we all consent to deliver her to the caprice, the obstinacy, the malice, of one citizen who would rule the Country alone, though she perish under the burden of evil.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Stanislav’ solution to the problems posed by the veto – that it should be used more responsibly – appears somewhat tame when we consider how the former King had viewed the veto in the past. Yet, we must consider the fact at the same time that for an ex-King to suggest an end to the so-called golden liberties would have been viewed with immense suspicion, and would likely have confirmed the absolutist suspicions many in the Commonwealth seemed to hold for their kings. Instead, through this approach, Stan was able to reason that the device was in desperate need of reform, that it needed to be used more responsibly, and that the nobility of the Commonwealth had it in their powers to make such a change. Much of the rest of his *free voice* pamphlet was taken up with musings over the responsibility that the nobility had for their peasants, whom Stanislav displayed a remarkable pity and consideration for, asking that in the contract between lord and lorded over:

For what difference is there between us? Only a few perishable goods; at bottom we are all equal; and the man whose lack of those goods leads us to scorn him is perhaps far above us in those real treasures which are the essence and glory of man.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Some thirty years after Stanislav’ tract was released, another more famous philosopher by the name of Jean Jacques Rousseau released his *Social Contract*, wherein the relationship between the nobility and their serfs was commented upon and a morality and kindness within that relationship was eagerly encouraged. It is easy to question whether Stanislav Lechynski managed to influence Rousseau in some fashion, but whatever the likelihood of such an event, Stanislav remained utterly convinced not merely of the inherent justice in his pleas for the improvement of social conditions, but also in their divinely approved status. His strong Christian faith led Stanislav always back to the question of the welfare of the people, which he seemed, whatever his faults, to have a genuine concern for.

Stanislav lent also his pen and imagination to the question of world peace, and how the Commonwealth and the rest of Europe was to achieve it in an atmosphere of constantly competing states. Commenting on the nature of war in his memoirs, Stan noted:

It is true, and constantly true, that we do not ordinarily go to war except to achieve a good peace. All who make war seek *through* war to arrive at a peace more perfect than existed before war. No one seeks peace to stir up war, but war to establish peace…But if wars are inevitable, let us seek at least a way to render them fatal only to those who are not afraid to provoke them.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Stanislav’ additional ideas over how to establish a long lasting European peace included placing all of Europe under one governmental system; placing Europe into different leagues of states with France as the arbiter of them all, and with the French necessarily building up a vast navy so that it could strike at any evil-doer in this new system. Such plans were as bold as they were naïve, since we understand now that mid-18th century Europe had many more conflicts to come, yet Stanislav was writing and thinking in a developing world, where ideas could inspire vast changes in how things were created and how states were run. Having lived through an age of enlightenment which swept across the continent, taking root most famously in Britain and in certain German states, Stanislav would certainly have found like-minded Europeans tired of war and determined to invest those vast energies in more humane enterprises. It is not difficult, it has to be said, to see something of the later system of overarching supranational institutions in Stanislav’ suggestions – the League of Nations, the UN or the EU – yet Stanislav was far from the only thinker in this regard, and he ensured that his estate at Nancy in Lorraine welcomed all sorts of European thinkers, to the extent that the well-to-do really could dream and imagine a world without war, or at least, a world without war that laid waste to so much of value.

To round off on our analysis of Stanislav Lechynski, before he mostly disappears from our narrative as we look at affairs developing in the PLC, it is worth considering these words from the historian Eleanor , who wrote the following eulogy of good King Stan:

Considering the calamities of his own day, his successive disappointments, the future promising only worse disaster, one might well ask, why did not Lechynski just submit to circumstances and quietly abandon the struggle. The answer is simply that it would have been un-Polish, because un-Christian to do so; and Lechynski, for all his shortcomings, was genuinely both. Not a great leader perhaps, not a saint nor a hero, he nevertheless contributed much to the reform of his country. Moreover, he reflected in his life one of the great glories of the Polish nation, the virtue of Christian hope, rooted there perhaps more strongly than anywhere in the world because it had been so often and so bitterly tried.[[8]](#footnote-8)

It was through hope, through finding solace in the idea that one day things would be different and better in Poland, that Stanislav was kept working. We can only imagine how difficult it must have been as he aged to see his homeland drift further and further towards disaster, and we can only believe that if he had lived long enough to see the first partition come to pass in 1772, only 6 years after his death, then he would have raised a strong and passionate voice against it whatever it cost him. Stanislav was presiding over an era in his country’s history which seemed without laws or justice, where the strong was content to prey upon the weak and when those that could help sat on their hands or searched opportunistically for their own advantage. Appalled as he certainly was by such a scene, he was kept going by the promise of the Polish people and the strong, proud memory of that nation.

It is a memory and belief we will have to keep close to our hearts and minds as well, if we are to traverse what is to come in this story. So long as the people of Poland lived to represent their historical and traditional homeland, it was safe enough to say that Poland was not yet lost. Next time, we will resume our coverage of the WPS, and examine how it changed affairs in Europe to the detriment of the PLC, and to the gain of the Bourbons who had set such a conflict into motion. Until then history friends, my name is Zack, thanks for listening and I’ll see you all soon.
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