

## **Unit 2: Identifications and Study Questions**

### **Section A: The Opening of the Atlantic**

da Gama, Albuquerque, St. Francis Xavier, Magellan, "planting", treaty of 1494, conquistadores, Black Legend, viceroyalty, encomienda, mestizos, Potosi, University of Lima

1. Of what significance was Vasco da Gama's discovery of a sea route to the East? Why was there opposition to the arrival of the Portuguese in India? How did the Portuguese meet it?
2. How did Columbus react to his "discovery"? How did others in Spain regard the new land?
3. How would you assess the nature of the Spanish empire in America? What were the favorable and unfavorable aspects?
4. Compare and contrast the empires created by Portugal in the East and by Spain in America.
5. How did the voyages and discoveries of the 15th and 16th centuries add to existing geographic knowledge?

### **Section B: The Commercial Revolution**

price revolution, guild, entrepreneur, Medici, Fugger, usury, commercial capitalism, mercantilism, favorable balance of trade, Statute of Artificers, internal tariffs, chartered trading companies

1. What important changes in the early modern times are summarized under the term "commercial revolution"?
2. Describe the growth of European population in the 16th century and the nature of this growth.
3. Explain the origins, nature, and effects of the "putting out" or "domestic" system. Of what importance were the needs of the military in the rise of capitalism? What change in attitudes could be noted toward the lending of money at interest?
4. Explain the general nature and purpose of mercantilism, citing examples of mercantilist policies and regulations. What comparison can be made between mercantilism and the New Monarchies?

### **Section C: Changing Social Structures**

social structure, yeoman, Poor Law of 1601, bourgeois, robot, hidalgo, college, Ursuline sisters, plebeians, hereditary subjection, Junker

1. Describe the economic classes emerging in Europe in the early modern centuries. What effect did the economic changes of the 16th century have upon each class?
2. What accounted for the new demand for education?
3. Why did the economic changes of these years affect the rural classes of eastern Europe and of Western Europe differently? With what consequences?

## **Section D: The Crusade of Catholic Spain: The Dutch and English**

Austrian and Spanish Hapsburgs, siglo de oro, Escorial, Joyeuse Entree, Duke of Alva, Council of Troubles, Duke of Norfolk, Lepanto, William the Silent, Mary Queen of Scots, Don Juan, Prince of Parma, Union of Utrecht, Sir Francis Drake, armada catolica, Twelve years' Truce

1. Why could Philip II rightly regard himself as an international figure? Why was Spain ideally suited to be the instrument of Philip's ambitions?
2. How would you describe and characterize the general state of political and religious affairs in the Europe in the first years of Philip's reign? What conflict existed between religious and national loyalties?
3. How permanent were the triumphs of Philip and the Catholic cause in the years 1567 to 1572?
4. Explain the political, economic, and religious factors that entered into the revolt of the Netherlands. How did the revolt merge with the international political and religious struggles in Europe?
5. How would you analyze the reasons for Spain's decline?

## **Section E: The Disintegration and Reconstruction of France**

"boy kings", Huguenot, Catherine de Medici, Admiral de Coligny, "three Henrys", politiques, St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre, Jean Bodin, Edict of Nantes, parlement, Estates-General, rebellion of La Rochelle, Peace of Alais

1. To what extent had the monarchy succeeded in imposing unity on France by the second half of the 16th century? What is meant by the term "feudal" as used after the Middle Ages?
2. Describe the background, nature, and outcome of the civil and religious wars in France in the 16th century.
3. Of what long range significance was the position taken by the politiques in the French civil wars?
4. How did Henry IV come to the throne in 1589? What was the deeper meaning of his reputed remark, "Paris is well worth a mass"?
5. How did Henry attempt to settle the religious issue? Of what significance was his reign for the development of the French monarchy?
6. How would you assess the objectives and accomplishments of Cardinal Richelieu?

## **Section F: The Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648: The Disintegration of Germany**

Holy Roman Empire, Peace of Augsburg, Ecclesiastical Reservation, Matthias, Ferdinand II, Frederick V, Protestant Union, "defenstration of Prague", Battle of White Mountain, Edict of Restitution, Wallenstein, Gustavus Adolphus, Oxenstierna, Peace of Westphalia, German liberties

1. How had the Peace of Augsburg attempted to settle the religious question in German? What went wrong?
2. How can one analyze the issues of the Thirty Years' War? How did European rivalries and ambitions become linked to the conflict with German?
3. Sketch briefly the events associated with each major phase of the war.
4. Evaluate the Peace in terms of religion, territory and constitutional issues. What was the sig. of the war?

## **Section G: The Grand Monarque and the Balance of Power**

Grand Monarque, Sun King, Charles II of Spain, Franche Comte, "universal monarchy"

1. What observations can be made about the significance of Western Europe in the development of modern civilization since about 1650?
2. What general statements can be made about the nature of Louis XIV's rule in France and about the role of France in European affairs during his reign?
3. Why did Louis XIV's foreign policy arouse the opposition of the rest of Europe?
4. Explain the nature of the "balance of power" that was employed against Louis XIV. Of what broad significance has the "balance of power" concept been in diplomatic history?

## **Section H: Britain: The Puritan Revolution**

Puritan, Presbyterian, Anglican, James VI of Scotland, The True Law of Free Monarchy, "tunnage and poundage", Archbishop Laud, prerogative courts, ship money case, Long Parliament, Solemn League and Covenant, Roundheads, Independents, Pride's Purge, the Rump, Levellers, Diggers, Fifth Monarchy Men, Instrument of Government

1. What comparisons may be made between events in England in the 17th century and developments on the Continent?
2. Why did Parliament come into conflict with James I? with Charles I? How did the special nature of Parliament make its resistance effective?
3. How did the civil war begin? How did Cromwell emerge as ruler of England?
4. Describe the government of England under the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. What is meant by the regime of the "major generals"?
5. What policies did Cromwell follow toward Scotland? Ireland? in foreign affairs? toward the more radical elements emerging in England?
6. How would you evaluate Cromwell's role in English history?

## **Section I: Britain: The Triumph of Parliament**

Charles II, Dissenters, treaty of Dover, declaration of indulgence, Test Act, Whigs and Tories, trial of the seven bishops, Glorious Revolution, William and Mary, battle of the Boyne, Bill of Rights, United Kingdom of Great Britain, Act of Settlement of 1701, Toleration Act, penal code for Ireland

1. Explain the general nature of the Restoration in England. Of what significance was the legislation enacted by the Restoration Parliament?
2. How did religious matters again bring Parliament and king into conflict? What policies of James II precipitated the Revolution of 1688?

3. Summarize the legislation introduced after 1688. Of what significance was William's acceptance of the Bill of Rights?
4. Why was the Revolution of 1688 constitutionally important for England? Why have recent writers "deglorified" the revolution? Give arguments for and against this point of view.
5. What were the consequences of these events for Scotland and Ireland?

**Section J: The France of Louis XIV, 1643-1715: The Triumph of Absolutism**

parlements, Fronde, Cardinal Mazarine, Bishop Bossuet, divine right of kings, Versailles, intendants, councils of state, tax farmers, Colbert, Five Great Farms, Commercial Code, French East India Company, revocation of the Edict of Nantes

1. What factors accounted for France's leadership during the age of Louis XIV? Describe French culture.
2. How did Louis develop the "state" in its modern form? What is the deeper meaning of "L'`etat, c'est moi"?
3. What arguments were used to justify the divine right kings of the 17th century?
4. Discuss Louis' (a) military and administrative reforms, (b) economic and financial policies, (c) religious policies.
5. How would you assess the reign of Louis XIV from a diplomatic point of view?

**Section K: The Wars of Louis XIV: The Peace of Utrecht, 1713**

War of devolution, Dutch War, Treaty of Nimwegen, chambers de reunion, War of the League of Augsburg, Peace of Ryswick, Charles II, "The Pyrenees exist no longer", William III, John Churchill, Philip V, Grand Alliance of 1701, Prince Eugene of Savoy, treaties of Utrecht and Rastadt, asiento, Dutch barrier

1. Describe Louis' foreign policy prior to the War of Spanish Succession. Why were the chambers de reunion important?
2. What features of the War of Spanish Succession made it distinctive? Why was the war fought?
3. Summarize the main developments of the war. What motives prompted each state to fight?
4. What were the major provisions of the Treaty of Utrecht? On what basis were differences between the great powers settled?

# Letter to Lord Sanchez, 1493

## Christopher Columbus

*The voyages of Christopher Columbus (1451-1506) open the New World to Europe and marked the entry of Spain into the process of exploration, expansion, and conquest initiated by Portugal. Columbus was a Genoese explorer who, after great difficulties, convinced the Spanish monarchs, Queen Isabella and King Ferdinand, to support his voyages across the Atlantic. He expected to discover a western route to Asia and its riches. Instead he landed on several islands of the Caribbean, which he assumed were part of Asia. The following letter to Lord Raphael Sanchez, treasurer to the Spanish monarchs, was written by Columbus in Lisbon on March 14, 1493, shortly after returning from his first voyage across the Atlantic. In this excerpt, he describes the native people he encountered.*

*Consider: How Columbus viewed the natives; what Columbus was most concerned with; how this letter reflects Columbus' motives.*

The inhabitants of both sexes in this island, and in all the others which I have seen, or of which I have received information, go always naked as they were born, with the exception of some of the women, who use the covering of leaf, or small bough, or an apron of cotton which they prepare for that purpose. None of them, as I have already said, are possessed of any iron, neither have they weapons, being unacquainted with, and indeed incompetent to use them, not from any deformity of body (for they are well-formed), but because they are timid and full of fear. They carry however in lieu of arms, canes dried in the sun, on the ends of which they fix heads of dried wood sharpened to a point, and even these they dare not use habitually; for it has often occurred when I have sent two or three of my men to any of the villages to speak with the natives, that they have come out in a disorderly troop, and have fled in such haste at the approach of our men, that the fathers forsook their children and the children their fathers. This timidity did not arise from any loss or injury that they had received from us; for, on the contrary, I gave to all I approached whatever articles I had about me, such as cloth and many other things, taking nothing of theirs in return: but they are naturally timid and fearful. As soon however as they see that they are safe, and have laid aside all fear, they are very simple and honest, and exceedingly liberal with all they have: none of them refusing any thing he may possess when he is asked for it, but on the contrary inviting us to ask them. They exhibit great love towards all others in preference to themselves: they also give objects of great value for trifles, and content themselves with very little or nothing in return. I however forbade that these trifles and articles of no value (such as pieces of dishes, plates, and glass, keys, and ar-leather straps) should be given to them, although if they could obtain them, they imagined themselves to be possessed of the most beautiful trinkets in the world. It even happened that a sailor received for a leather strap as much gold as was worth three golden nobles, and for things of more trifling value offered by our men, especially newly coined blancas, or any gold

coins, the Indians would give whatever the seller required; as, for instance, an ounce and a half or two ounces of gold, or thirty or forty pounds of cotton, with which commodity they were already acquainted. Thus they bartered, like idiots, cotton and gold for fragments of bows, glasses, bottles, and jars; which I forbade as being unjust, and myself gave them many beautiful and acceptable articles which I had brought with me, taking nothing from them in return; I did this in order that I might the more easily conciliate them, that they might be led to become Christians, and be inclined to entertain a regard for the King and Queen, our Princes and all Spaniards, and that I might induce them to take an interest in seeking out, and collecting, and delivering to us such things as they possessed in abundance, but which we greatly needed. They practise no kind of idolatry, but have a firm belief that all strength and power, and indeed all good things, are in heaven, and that I had descended from thence with these ships and sailors, and under this impression was I received after they had thrown aside their fears. Nor are they slow or stupid, but of very clear understanding; and those men who have crossed to the neighbouring islands give an admirable description of everything they observed; but they never say any people clothed, nor any ships like ours. On my arrival at that sea, I had taken some Indians by force from the first island that I came to, in order that they might learn our language, and communicate to us what they knew respecting the country; which plan succeeded excellently, and was a great advantage to us, for in a short time, either by gestures and signs, or by words, we were enabled to understand each other. These men are still travelling with me, and although they have been with us now a long time, they continue to entertain the idea that I have descended from heaven; and on our arrival at any new place they published this, crying out immediately with a loud voice to the other Indians, "Come, come and look upon beings of a celestial race"; upon which both women and men, children and adults, young men and old, when they got rid of the fear they at first entertained, would come out in throngs, crowding the roads to see us, some bringing food, others drink, with astonishing affection and kindness. . . . In all these islands there is no difference of physiognomy, of manners, or of language, but they all clearly understand each other, a circumstance very propitious for the realization of what I conceive to be the principal wish of our most serene King, namely, the conversion of these people to the holy faith of Christ, to which indeed, as far as I can judge, they are very favourable and well-disposed.

Unit 2

Supplemental Readings

For All Sections

# The Expansion of Europe

Richard B. Reed

*In analyzing the overseas expansion of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, historians typically emphasize a combination of economic and religious factors to explain the motivation behind expansion while focusing on the establishment of adequate knowledge and technology as key conditions for its occurrence. In the following selection Richard B. Reed of Bowdoin College argues that European expansion was a nationalistic phenomenon, and because of this Portugal was able to become the early leader.*

*Consider: Why Italy and Germany did not participate in overseas expansion; how one might attack Reed's argument that Portugal was in a better position to initiate expansion than any other country; other factors that might help explain why Portugal led in overseas expansion.*

The expansion of Europe was an intensely nationalistic phenomenon. It was an aspect of the trend, most evident in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, toward the establishment of strong centralized authority in the "new monarchies," as they have been called, and the emergence of the nation-state. A policy of overseas expansion required a degree of internal stability and national consciousness that only a powerful central government could command. Portugal achieved this position long before her eventual competitors, and under the leadership of the dynamic house of Avis became a consolidated kingdom comparatively free from feudal divisions before the end of the fifteenth century. While Spain was still divided into a number of conflicting political jurisdictions, England and France were preoccupied with their own and each other's affairs, and the Dutch were still an appendage of the Empire, the Portuguese combined the advantages of their natural geographic situation with their political and economic stability to initiate the age of discovery. Spain in the sixteenth century, and England, France, and the Netherlands in the seventeenth century, became active colonial powers only after each had matured into strong national entities, independent of feudal political and economic restrictions. . . .

The importance of the nation-state in Renaissance expansion is particularly apparent when the Italian city-states are considered. Venice and Genoa, cities that had contributed so many of the medieval travelers and early Renaissance geographers and mapmakers, did not participate directly in Europe's overseas expansion. Yet Italian names dominated the rolls of the early voyagers. Prince Henry employed Venetians and Florentines in his naval establishment, while Columbus, Vespucci, Verrazano, the Cabots, and many others sailed for Spain, France, and England. Italian cartography was the best in Europe until the second half of the sixteenth century, and a high proportion of the books and pamphlets that chronicled new discoveries emanated from the presses of Vicenza, Venice, Rome, and Florence. Italian bankers and merchants were also very active in the commercial life of the principal Iberian cities. A divided Italy was instrumental in making Renaissance expansion possible, but it could not take full advantage of its own endowments. Germans, too, figured prominently in the expansion of the sixteenth century, as the names of Federmann, Staden, Welser, and Fugger attest. But Germany, like Italy, was not united, and the emergence of these two nations as colonial powers had to wait until their respective consolidations in the nineteenth century.

While every nationality in Western Europe was represented in Renaissance expansion, it was by no means an international venture. On the contrary, it was very much an expression of that nationalistic fervor that characterized political developments in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It was primarily a state enterprise, often financed privately but controlled and protected by the governments of the concerned powers. There was no cooperation between nations, and even after the upheaval of the Protestant Reformation, when political loyalties and alignments were conditioned by religious sympathies, there were no colonial alliances that provided for mutual Protestant or Catholic overseas policies.

# Austria Over All If She Only Will: Mercantilism

Philipp W. von Hornick

Mercantilism, a loose set of economic ideas and corresponding government policies, was a common component of absolutism during the seventeenth century. Typical mercantilist goals were the acquisition of bullion, a positive balance of trade, and economic self-sufficiency. An unusually clear and influential statement of mercantilist policies was published in 1684 by Philipp Wilhelm von Hornick. A lawyer and later a government official, Hornick set down what he considered to be the nine principal rules for a proper economic policy. These are excerpted here.

Consider: The political and military purposes served by encouraging mercantilist policies: the foreign policy decisions such economic policies would support; the political and economic circumstances that would make it easiest for a country to adhere to and benefit from mercantilist policies.

## NINE PRINCIPAL RULES OF NATIONAL ECONOMY

If the might and eminence of a country consist in its surplus of gold, silver, and all other things necessary or convenient for its subsistence, derived, so far as possible, from its own resources, without dependence upon other countries, and in the proper fostering, use, and application of these, then it follows that a general national economy (*Landes-Oeconomie*) should consider how such a surplus, fostering, and enjoyment can be brought about, without dependence upon others, or where this is not feasible in every respect, with as little dependence as possible upon foreign countries, and sparing use of the country's own cash. For this purpose the following nine rules are especially serviceable.

(First) to inspect the country's soil with the greatest care, and not to leave the agricultural possibilities or a single corner or clod of earth unconsidered. Every useful form of plant under the sun should be experimented with, to see whether it is adapted to the country, for the distance or nearness of the sun is not all that counts. Above all, no trouble or expense should be spared to discover gold and silver.

(Second) all commodities found in a country, which cannot be used in their natural state, should be worked up within the country; since the pay-

ment for manufacturing generally exceeds the value of the raw material... by two, three, ten, twenty, and even a hundred fold, and the neglect of this is an abomination to prudent managers.

(Third) for carrying out the above two rules, there will be need of people, both for producing and cultivating the raw materials and for working them up. Therefore, attention should be given to the population, that it may be as large as the country can support, this being a well-ordered state's most important concern, but, unfortunately, one that is often neglected. And the people should be turned by all possible means from idleness to remunerative professions; instructed and encouraged in all kinds of inventions, arts, and trades; and, if necessary, instructors should be brought in from foreign countries for this.

(Fourth) gold and silver once in the country, whether from its own mines or obtained by industry from foreign countries, are under no circumstances to be taken out for any purpose, so far as possible, or allowed to be buried in chests or coffers, but must always remain in circulation; nor should much be permitted in uses where they are at once destroyed and cannot be utilized again. For under these conditions, it will be impossible for a country that has once acquired a considerable supply of cash, especially one that possesses gold and silver mines, ever to sink into poverty; indeed, it is impossible that it should not continually increase in wealth and property. Therefore,

(Fifth) the inhabitants of the country should make every effort to get along with their domestic products, to confine their luxury to these alone, and to do without foreign products as far as possible (except where great need leaves no alternative, or if not need, wide-spread, unavoidable abuse, of which Indian spices are an example). And so on.

(Sixth) in case the said purchases were indispensable because of necessity or irremediable abuse, they should be obtained from these foreigners at first hand, so far as possible, and not for gold or silver, but in exchange for other domestic wares.

(Seventh) such foreign commodities should in this case be imported in unfinished form, and worked up within the country, thus earning the wages of manufacture there.

(Eighth) opportunities should be sought night and day for selling the country's superfluous goods to these foreigners in manufactured form, so far as this is necessary, and for gold and silver; and to this end, consumption, so to speak, must be sought in the farthest ends of the earth, and developed in every possible way.

(Ninth) except for important considerations, no importation should be allowed under any circumstances of commodities of which there is sufficient supply of suitable quality at home; and in this matter neither sympathy nor compassion should be shown foreigners, be they friends, kinsfolk, allies, or enemies. For all friendship ceases, when it involves my own weakness and ruin. And this holds good, even if the domestic commodities are of poorer quality, or even higher priced. For it would be better to pay for an article two dollars which remain in the country than only one which goes out, however strange this may seem to the ill-informed.

# Centuries of Childhood

*Philippe Ariès*

*Through analysis of paintings such as Maternal Care by Pieter de Hooch (see page 365) as well as other kinds of evidence, historians have changed our assumptions about attitudes toward childhood in Early Modern times. The most important of these historians is Philippe Ariès. The following is a selection from his Centuries of Childhood.*

*Consider: How this reading relates to Hooch's painting; the differences between the seventeenth-century family, the medieval family, and the modern family according to Ariès.*

---

Between the end of the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century, the child had won a place beside his parents to which he could not lay claim at a time when it was customary to entrust him to strangers. This return of the children to the home was a great event: it gave the seventeenth-century family its principal characteristic, which distinguished it from the medieval family. The child became an indispensable element of everyday life, and his parents worried about his education, his career, his future. He was not yet the pivot of the whole system, but he had become a much more important character. Yet this seventeenth-century family was not the modern family: it was distinguished from the latter by the enormous mass of sociability which it retained. Where the family existed, that is to say in the big houses, it was a centre of social relations, the capital of a little complex and graduated society under the command of the paterfamilias.

The modern family, on the contrary, cuts itself off from the world and opposes to society the isolated group of parents and children. All the energy of the group is expended on helping the children to rise in the world, individually and without any collective ambition: the children rather than the family.



# Parents and Children in History

David Hunt

*Over time the family has remained the most basic institution of social life in Western civilization. In many ways, the family is resistant to change, and thus we can recognize traits of family life in the past as similar to our own. Nevertheless, the family has changed in important ways over time, reflecting the evolving nature of Western societies. In the following selection, David Hunt uses some of the insights of modern psychology and sociology to analyze the family in seventeenth-century France.*

*Consider: How the family reflected the broader social system; the importance of the distinction between marriages of love and those of interest; how this reading complements the selection by Ariès and Hooch's painting.*

. . . [I]n the seventeenth century people felt strongly the contrast between the loyalties and duties incumbent upon them as a consequence of their station in society on the one hand, and their natural inclinations on the other. Institutional arrangements always implied a gradation of rank and were thus held to be incompatible with friendship, in which equality between the partners was so important. Far from accepting the fact that personal relations were almost always arranged according to hierarchical principles, individuals were made acutely uncomfortable by this situation. In personal letters, writers often distinguished sincere and spontaneous affection from the more perfunctory good will which went with the formal relationship to their correspondent. Thus Madame de Sévigné, in sending good wishes to her daughter, stipulated that, "In this case, maternal love plays less of a part than inclination."

As the quote indicates, the family was caught up in this system. To be a brother, son, or wife was a status, with its special obligations, its place in a grid of rule and submission. Members of the family were supposed to love one another; paternal, maternal, fraternal love were all often cited as models of human fellow feeling. At the same time, even within the family, it was terribly hard to imagine a relationship of mutual affection which was not simultaneously one of ruler and ruled. Like the bond between master and servant, between seigneur and peasant, between king and subject, family ties, while steeped in a folklore of pious harmony, implied as well the power to dominate others, to claim rewards, or, on the contrary, the awareness of a helpless dependence.

This line of argument will help to explain further the distinction which, as we have seen, observers made with such clarity between marriages of love and those of interest. Marriages of love implied spontaneous affection between the two lovers, who were concerned primarily with their own happiness. Marriage of interest involved social and financial considerations to be arranged for the benefit of families. These observers understood very well that in a social system which attempted to subordinate the wishes of marriageable children to the ambitions of their parents, and in which the wife was regarded simply as the means of cementing alliances between families, marriage could not at the same time be expected to provide for the happiness and the emotional satisfaction of the partners.

. . . [G]radations of rank within the household were interpreted simply as a matter of power and of usage, and that people believed this situation discouraged close and mutually satisfying relationships among family members. Ideally, those of lower rank should have accepted the eminence of their superiors and been warmed by the benefits they received from an admittedly unequal partnership. In fact, inequality within the domestic unit filled people not with love and warmth, but with resentment and a feeling of "shame and envy."

# Civil War in France

Busbecq ARE ambassador

why?

France was one of the first areas in which the turmoil, instability, and war characteristic of the period between 1560 and 1660 occurred. There, political and religious divisions combined to produce a long period of bloodshed and sporadic civil war. The nature and effects of this turmoil are described in the following selection from a letter written in 1575 by Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq, the Holy Roman Emperor's ambassador to France.

Consider: Busbecq's perception of the forces and grievances that were threatening to worsen the civil wars that had already broken out; the consequences of the civil wars for various segments of society.

Ever since the commencement of the civil wars which are distracting the country, there has been a terrible change for the worse. So complete is the alteration, that those who knew France before would not recognise her again. Everywhere are to be seen shattered buildings, fallen churches, and towns in ruins; while the traveller gazes horror-stricken on spots which have but lately been the scenes of murderous deeds and inhuman cruelties. The fields are left untilled: the farmer's stock and tools have been carried off by the soldier as his booty, he is plundered alike by Frenchman and by foreigner. Commerce is crippled; the towns lately thronged with merchants and customers are now mourning their desolation in the midst of closed shops and silent manufactories. Meanwhile, the inhabitants, ground down by ceaseless exactions, are crying out at the immense sums which are being squandered for nought, or applied to purposes for which they were never intended. They demand a reckoning in tones which breathe a spirit of rebellion. Men of experience, members of the oldest families in France, are in many cases regarded with suspicion, and either not allowed to come to Court, or left to vegetate at home. Besides the two parties into which Frenchmen are divided by their religious differences, there are also feuds and quarrels which affect every grade of society. more than just religious causes

In the first place, the feeling against the Italians who are in the French service is very strong; the high promotion they have received and the important duties with which they have been intrusted, arouse the jealousy of men who consider them ignorant of French business, and hold that they have neither merit, services, nor birth to justify their appointment. . . .

The feuds which separate the leading families of France are more bitter than those described in ancient tragedy; this is the state of feeling which exists between the Houses of Guise, Vendôme and Bourbon, not to mention that of Montmorency, which, through its alliances and connections, has a considerable party of its own.

# Political Will and Testament

## Richelieu

The civil wars in France were ended under the rule of Henry IV at the end of the sixteenth century. This strong king prevailed over rival factions and strengthened the French monarchy. But religious conflict and the competition with the nobility for authority were not over in France. Rather, the monarchy was built up toward a position of absolutism under a series of powerful figures, including Cardinal Richelieu (1585-1642), who served as principal adviser to the king between 1624 and 1642 and virtual ruler for most of that period. In the following selection from his Political Will and Testament, Richelieu presents his view of monarchical power.

Consider: How Richelieu justifies monarchical power; how Machiavelli might have responded to this view.

Power being one of the most necessary ingredients towards the grandeur of kings, and the prosperity of their governments; those who have the chief management of affairs are particularly obliged not to omit anything which may contribute to authorize their master so far as to make all the world reject him.

As goodness is the object of love, power is the cause of dread; and it is most certain, that among all the princes who are capable to stir a state, fear grounded upon esteem and reverence has so much force, that it engages everyone to perform his duty.

If this principle is of great efficacy in respect to the internal part of states, it is to the full as prevailing abroad: subjects and strangers looking with the same eyes upon a formidable power, both the one and the other abstain from offending a prince, whom they are sensible is in a condition to hurt them, if he were so inclined. *Don't offend a prince who is in a position to hurt you*

I have observed by the by, that the ground of the power I am speaking of must be esteem and respect; . . . that when it is grounded upon any other principle, it is very dangerous; in the case instead of creating a reasonable fear, it inclines men to hate princes, who are never in a worse condition than when it turns to public aversion.

The power which induces men to respect and fear princes with love . . . is a tree which has five divers branches, which all draw their nutriment and substance from one and the same root.

- ① The Prince must be powerful by his reputation.
- ② By a reasonable army always kept on foot.
- ③ And by a notable sum of money in his coffers, to supply unexpected exigencies, which often come to pass when they are least expected.
- ④ Finally, by the possession of his subjects' hearts. . .

# A Political Interpretation of the Thirty Years' War

Hajo Holborn

*clearly*  
*idea*  
*idea*  
Historians have long disagreed about the essential causes of the Thirty Years' War. Some focus on a particular area, such as Germany or Spain; others emphasize a particular set of causes, such as religion or politics; and still others argue that it was only part of a general seventeenth-century crisis affecting all aspects of society. In the following selection Hajo Holborn, a historian from Yale University known for his work on German history (argues that the war was primarily a political struggle in the German states of the Hapsburgs) He accepts the religious issue as at most a contributing cause.

Consider: The role religion played in the conflict even though it may not have been primary in causing the war; other factors that might have caused the war.

*1. How*  
*2. What*  
*not*  
*idea*  
*idea*  
*idea*  
*being*  
*what*  
It was not a conflict among European powers, not even an acute controversy between the emperor and the princes of the Empire or among these princes themselves that led to the outbreak of the long war that lived on in the memory of the German people as the "Great War" and in the books of the historians as the Thirty Years' War. Rather, it was a struggle between the estates and the monarchy in the territories of the Habsburg dynasty which set fire to all of Germany and to the European continent. Without the grave crisis in the constitutional life of the Empire, the weakness of the German states, and the ambitions of the great powers of Europe, the events that occurred in Bohemia could not have developed into a disaster from which Germany was to emerge crippled and mutilated.

*1. How*  
*2. What*  
*not*  
*idea*  
*idea*  
*idea*  
It is difficult to determine to what extent differences in the interpretation of Christian faith were a direct cause of the catastrophe. There is no doubt but that religious motivation was strong in the lives of individuals and societies, and even in the relations among states and nations, in this age. But the confessional war started at a time when enthusiasm for the religious revivals, both Protestant and Catholic, had lost much of its original force and religious ideas had again become conventionalized. Frank skepticism was rare in Germany, but ever larger groups of people had ceased to find in religious ideals the full satisfaction of their human aspirations. Nevertheless, the reality of heaven and hell was nowhere questioned, nor was the necessity of basing the political and social order on principles that would keep Satan from undoing the work of God. Religious zeal found expression not only in the ghastly fury of witch trials, which reached its climax during these years, but also in the care with which all governments attended to the direction of church life in their dominions. Yet while on the one hand religion deteriorated into superstition, on the other it tended to become formalized and to lose genuineness. Every political action was publicly cloaked in religious terms, but religion seemed to be used more and more to rationalize actions motivated by secular interests. ✓

*religion used to cloak the real political motives of the war.*

# A Religious Interpretation of the Thirty Years' War

Carl J. Friedrich

An older scholarly tradition attributes primary importance to religion in explaining the causes of the Thirty Years' War. This tradition has been revived by Carl J. Friedrich, a highly respected historian from Harvard. In *The Age of the Baroque, 1610-1680*, Friedrich places the war in the context of the still strong religious assumptions of the time, arguing that historians who emphasize political causes overlook the importance of this religious context. The following is an excerpt from that work.

Consider: The evidence Friedrich uses to support his argument; why, according to Friedrich, many historians have rejected the religious interpretation of the war; how Hobson might criticize this argument.

It has been the fashion to minimize the religious aspect of the great wars which raged in the heart of Europe, over the territory of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Not only the calculating statescraft of Richelieu and Mazarin, but even Pope Urban VIII's own insistence lent support to such a view in a later age which had come to look upon religion and politics as fairly well separated fields of thought and action. Liberal historians found it difficult to perceive that for baroque man religion and politics were cut from the same cloth; indeed that the most intensely political issues were precisely the religious ones. Come was the neopaganism

Source: Excerpt from pp. 161-162 from *The Age of the Baroque, 1610-1680* by Carl J. Friedrich. Copyright 1952 by Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. Reprinted by permission.

of the renaissance, with its preoccupation with self-fulfillment here and now. Once again, and for the last time, life was seen as meaningful in religious, even theological, terms, and the greater insight into power which the renaissance had brought served merely to deepen the political passion brought to the struggle over religious faiths.

Without a full appreciation of the close links between secular and religious issues, it becomes impossible to comprehend the Thirty Years' War. Frederick, the unlucky Palatine, as well as Ferdinand, Tilly and Gustavus Adolphus, Maximilian of Bavaria and John George of Saxony, they all must be considered fools unless their religious motivation is understood as the quintessential core of their politics. Time and again, they appear to have done the "wrong thing," if their actions are viewed in a strictly secular perspective. To be sure, men became increasingly sophisticated as the war dragged on; but even after peace was finally concluded in 1648, the religious controversies continued. Ever since the Diet of Augsburg (1555) had adopted the callous position that a man must confess the religion of those who had authority over the territory he lived in—a view which came to be known under the slogan of "*cuius regio, eius religio*"—the intimate tie of religion and government had been the basis of the Holy Empire's tenuous peace. Born of the spirit of its time—Lutheran otherworldliness combining with Humanistic indifferentism—this doctrine was no more than an unstable compromise between Catholics and Lutherans, the Calvinists being entirely outside its protective sphere. But in the seventeenth century not only the Calvinists, who by 1618 had become the fighting protagonists of Protestantism, but likewise the more ardent Catholics, inspired by the Council of Trent, by the Jesuits and Capuchins, backed by the power of Spain and filled with the ardor of the Counter Reformation, had come to look upon this doctrine as wicked and contrary to their deepest convictions.

When Ferdinand, after claiming the crown of Bohemia by heredity, proceeded to push the work of counter reformation, his strongest motivation was religious; so was the resistance offered by the Bohemian people, as well as Frederick's acceptance of the crown of Bohemia on the basis of an election. Dynastic and national sentiments played their part, surely, but they reinforced the basic religious urge. The same concurrence of religious with dynastic, political, even economic motives persisted throughout the protracted struggle, but the religious did not cease to be the all-pervasive feeling; baroque man, far from being bothered by the contradictions, experienced these polarities as inescapable.

If religion played a vital role in persuading Ferdinand II to dismiss his victorious general, it was even more decisive in inspiring Gustavus Adolphus to enter the war against both the emperor and the League. The nineteenth century, incapable of feeling the religious passions which stirred baroque humanity and much impressed with the solidified national states which the seventeenth century bequeathed to posterity, was prone to magnify the dynastic and often Machiavellian policies adopted by rulers who professed to be deeply religious, and the twentieth century has largely followed suit in denying the religious character of these wars. But it is precisely this capacity to regard the statesman as the champion of religion, to live and act the drama of man's dual dependence upon faith and power that constituted the quintessence of the baroque.

# The Thirty Years' War: A Critical Re-evaluation

S. H. Steinberg

More than any other treatment of the Thirty Years' War, the analysis of S. H. Steinberg challenges standard interpretations and illustrates the depth of the historical controversy. Steinberg not only rejects the political and religious interpretations as usually presented, he questions the fundamentally German orientation of the war. ✓

Consider: Steinberg's basis for rejecting the standard conception of the Thirty Years' War; how Friedrich might criticize Steinberg's argument concerning the religious motives for war.

The usual picture of the Thirty Years' War, as painted by German historians and accepted uncritically by most English and American scholars, can be summarized as follows: ① the war was one continuous struggle, fought almost exclusively on German soil, beginning with the Bohemian Revolt in 1618 and ending with the Peace of Westphalia in 1648; ② it was the last and greatest of the Wars of Religion kindled by the German and Swiss Reformation of the 1520s, which the non-German powers, namely Denmark, Sweden, and France, together with the half-Spanish Habsburgs, exploited for political ends of their own; ③ it completely destroyed the German economy, leaving behind an impoverished near-desert which had lost one-third, one-half, or even two-thirds of its population; and ④ it dealt a mortal blow to the intellectual, moral, and artistic life of Germany. ✓

Every one of these assertions can be challenged.

First, there was not one uninterrupted war, but about a dozen wars, fought at different times, in different parts of Europe, by different belligerents, for different aims, interrupted by years of truce or peace affecting different regions.

Second, the religious differences between the German Protestants and Catholics were indissolubly bound up with constitutional and political questions. While it is impossible to assess the ratio of religious, political, constitutional, and economic considerations which determined any particular move, religious questions, more often than not, merely provided ideological and propagandist grounds for very secular war aims and peace proposals. The involvement of non-German powers was due to the geographical position of Germany in the heart of Europe and to a number of factors which would have remained even if there had been no religious conflict. The head of the Austrian Habsburgs, for instance, king of Bohemia and of Hungary and ruler of his house's ancient patrimony on the Danube, in the Alps, and on the Upper Rhine was also Holy Roman emperor, nominal sovereign over the whole Reich or empire, that is, over all the other German princes; and the German princes were anxious to resist any expansion of his authority. The emperor's Spanish Habsburg cousins, at the same time, to whom he was closely bound by family ties, were nominally members of the empire insofar as they held Franche-Comté and the Netherlands (though the northern Netherlands had been in open revolt against Spain since 1572); and Spain was furthermore in dispute with France over certain Italian principalities over which the emperor was nominally overlord. The king of Denmark likewise was a member of the empire in his capacity as duke of Holstein and, eventually, as director of the Lower Saxon "Circle" of the empire. The Hohenzollerns of Brandenburg, electors of the empire, were vassals not only of Bohemia for certain fiefs in Silesia but also of Poland for their Duchy of Prussia. Finally, Sweden's Baltic policy led to encroachment on the Pomeranian part of the empire. These and other dynastic or territorial questions provided reasons or pretexts for German princes to call in foreign powers as well as for foreign powers to take sides in German or so-called German affairs.

Finally, the social, economic, and cultural impacts have been misinterpreted. Seen in their true perspective, they will be found on a par with the results of every war. . . .

The European struggle against the predominance of Spain is the main topic of all the hot and cold wars, diplomatic moves and alignments, religious and constitutional tensions which fill the history of the first half of the 17th century. The Thirty Years' War, so called, is merely a segment of this general upheaval. ✓

more than just relig. or just pol.

almost feudal relations between rulers in HRE and other areas

USVC ✓  
VRCW

challenges standard view

# The Emergence of the Great Powers

John B. Wolf

*Although individual kings played an important role in the rise of absolutism, absolutism resulted from more than personal ambition. Economic and political competition with other states and the consequent expansion of the army and the government bureaucracy contributed to the growing sense of the state as a distinct entity. This new sense of the state is analyzed in the following excerpt from The Emergence of the Great Powers. In it John B. Wolf underscores the movement toward modern politics among European governments during this period.*

*Consider: The evidence of the change in the conception and the reality of the state during this period; how the policies of Louis XIV and the great elector relate to Wolf's interpretation of the seventeenth-century state; whether Wolf's claim that "European governments were assuming a characteristically modern shape" is an exaggeration.*

In the Europe of the late seventeenth century the idea that the state encompassed and transcended crown and land, prince and people, was becoming established, reflecting a great revolution in political conceptions. Hailed by Grotius and the coterie of publicists who were developing the concept of international law, this new ideal was written into the public law of Europe by the great treaties from Westphalia (1648) to Nystad (1721). Thenceforth, not princes ruling by divine right, but civil and military bureaucracies provided order and form to society. Driven by the demands of war, kings and statesmen were forced to concentrate their attention upon the political and economic realities and to shape their policies to suit the interests of their states. Machiavelli had insisted upon state interest as the proper basis for politics; in the seventeenth century his ideas, buttressed with doctrines of natural law and natural rights, increasingly became the motive power of political action.

The pace of the revolution that transformed the king into the chief of a bureaucratic machine was accelerated by the very forces that created it. In earlier centuries lay scribes had joined the king's government and, as secretaries, had discharged many administrative and judicial functions. But

Source: John B. Wolf, *The Emergence of the Great Powers, 1685-1715*. Reprinted by permission of Harper & Row (New York, 1951), pp. 3-4. Copyright © 1951 by Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

in the course of the seventeenth century these men of the pen had won a sensational victory over the men of the sword even in the domain of political action. At the opening of the century the councils of princes had still been composed of great noblemen and of clergymen who were the sons of noblemen, in short of men whose feudal conceptions were ill suited to the political requirements of the emerging states system. But within the century these aristocrats had been displaced by the rising class of career bureaucrats, whose relatively humble origins made them conscious of the state rather than of estates. These officials, many of them learned jurists with university educations or sons of royal officials with bourgeois backgrounds, together with a sprinkling of great lords who were willing to stake their fortunes on the state, formed the nucleus of the civil and military bureaucracies. Their careers and fortunes depended upon their service to the state and the favor of the prince; their duties almost forced them to see the problems of politics in operational terms. Commerce, finance, fortifications, the delineation of frontiers, the collection of taxes, the administration of revenues, and the organization of armies and navies were their daily tasks. Such problems were becoming the primary concern of governments and therefore became inevitably issues of high politics. Louis XIV may well have dreamed of the Bourbon dynasty's ruling Germany, France, and Spain, but the Rhine frontier, the Dutch commercial monopolies, the growth of English commerce, the strategic importance of fortifications, and the problems of maintaining a navy at sea were the concerns of his principal advisers. In time the exigencies of war and politics forced even Louis to accept the role of chief official, administrator of a civil and military bureaucracy.

The same process was at work elsewhere. As Europe came to be ruled by great military states, those states had to act increasingly in terms of state interest. The great political problems that grew out of the decay of the Holy Roman and Spanish empires seemed to reflect dynastic politics, but in the actual course of events political realities, based upon military, commercial, and financial considerations, became the predominant counters. The rise of great standing armies and their maintenance in the field made strenuous demands upon the treasury and the credit of the kings. In order to assure a continuous flow of revenue from taxation, and implement policies that would increase the riches of their potential taxpayers, and officials primarily interested in maintaining the power of their state inevitably urged policies that coincided with state interest. Thus European governments were assuming a characteristically modern shape and thereby rendering dynastic politics altogether anachronistic.

# The Powers of the Monarch in England

## James I

*In England friction between the monarchy and Parliament increased under the Stuart kings, starting with James I. Already the Scottish monarch, James became King of England on the death of Elizabeth in 1603. James had a scholarly background and a reputation for his strong views about the monarchy. One of his clearest presentations of these views was in a speech to Parliament made in 1610. In it, he comments on the nature of the king's power, not simply in England but everywhere.*

Consider: How James justifies the high position and vast powers he feels should rightly belong to kings; the limits to monarchical powers.

6.1.2  
The state of Monarchy is the supremest thing upon earth; for kings are not only God's lieutenants upon earth and sit upon God's throne, but even by God himself they are called gods. There be three principal similitudes that illustrate the state of Monarchy: one taken out of the Word of God and the two other out of the grounds of policy and philosophy. In the Scriptures kings are called gods, and so their power after a certain relation compared to the Divine power. Kings are also compared to the fathers of families, for a king is truly *parens patriae*, the politic father of his people. And lastly, kings are compared to the head of his microcosm of the body of man.

Kings are justly called gods for that they exercise a manner or resemblance of Divine power upon earth; for if you will consider the attributes to God you shall see how they agree in the person of a king. God hath power to create or destroy, make or unmake, at his pleasure; to give life or send death; to judge all, and to be judged nor accomptable to none; to raise low things and to make high things low at his pleasure; and to God are both soul and body due. And the like power have kings; they make and unmake their subjects; they have power of raising and casting down; of life and of death; judges over all their subjects and in all causes, and yet accomptable to none but God only. They have power to exalt low things and abase high things, and make of their subjects like men at the chess, a pawn to take a bishop or a knight, and to cry up or down any of their subjects as they do their money. And to the King is due both the affection of the soul and the service of the body of his subjects. . . .

As for the father of a family, they had of old under the Law of Nature *patriam potestatem*, which was *potestatem vitae et necis*, over their children or family, (I mean such fathers of families as were the lineal heirs of those families whereof kings did originally come), for kings had their first original from them who planted and spread themselves in colonies through the world. Now a father may dispose of his inheritance to his children at his pleasure, yea, even disinherit the eldest upon just occasions and prefer the youngest, according to his liking; make them beggars or rich at his pleasure; restrain or banish out of his presence, as he finds them give cause of offence, or restore them in favour again with the penitent sinner. So may the King deal with his subjects.

And lastly, as for the head of the natural body, the head hath the power of directing all the members of the body to that use which the judgment in the head thinks most convenient. . . .



# The Powers of Parliament in England

## The House of Commons

James's views on monarchical powers were not accepted by members of Parliament. Indeed, from the beginning of his reign through the reign of his son Charles I. king and Parliament struggled over their relative powers. Along with other problems, this struggle culminated in the 1640s with the outbreak of civil war and the eventual beheading of Charles I. The nature of this struggle is partially revealed in the following statements issued by the House of Commons in 1604 to the new king, James I.

Consider: The powers over which the House of Commons and the king differed; the justifications used by James I and the House of Commons for their claims; any ways in which compromise was possible between these two positions.

Now concerning the ancient rights of the subjects of this realm, chiefly consisting in the privileges of this House of Parliament, the misinformation openly delivered to your Majesty hath been in three things:

*...in the  
...in the  
...in the  
...in the*

First, That we held not privileges of right, but of grace only, renewed every Parliament by way of donature upon petition, and so to be limited.  
Secondly, That we are no Court of Record, nor yet a Court that can command view of records, but that our proceedings here are only to acts and memorials, and that the attendance with the records is courtesy, not duty.  
Thirdly and lastly, That the examination of the return of writs for knights and burgesses is without our compass, and due to the Chancery.

Against which assertions, most gracious Sovereign, tending directly and apparently to the utter overthrow of the very fundamental privileges of our House, and therein of the rights and liberties of the whole Commons of your realm of England which they and their ancestors from time immemorable have undoubtedly enjoyed under your Majesty's most noble progenitors, we, the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the House of Commons assembled in Parliament, and in the name of the whole commons of the realm of England, with uniform consent for ourselves and our posterity, do expressly protest, as being derogatory in the highest degree to the true dignity, liberty, and authority of your Majesty's High Court of Parliament, and consequently to the rights of all your Majesty's said subjects and the whole body of this your kingdom: And desire that this our protestation may be recorded to all posterity.

And contrariwise, with all humble and due respect to your Majesty our Sovereign Lord and Head, against those misinformations we most truly avouch,

First, That our privileges and liberties are our right and due inheritance, no less than our very lands and goods.

Secondly, That they cannot be withheld from us, denied, or impaired, but with apparent wrong to the whole state of the realm.

Thirdly, And that our making of request in the entrance of Parliament to enjoy our privilege is an act only of manners, and doth weaken our right no more than our suing to the King for our lands by petition. . . .

Fourthly, We avouch also, That our House is a Court of Record, and so ever esteemed.

Fifthly, That there is not the highest standing Court in this land that ought to enter into competency, either for dignity or authority, with this High Court of Parliament, which with your Majesty's royal assent gives laws to other Courts but from other Courts receives neither laws nor orders.

Sixthly and lastly, We avouch that the House of Commons is the sole proper judge of return of all such writs and of the election of all such members as belong to it, without which the freedom of election were not entire: And that the Chancery, though a standing Court under your Majesty, be to send out those writs and receive the returns and to preserve them, yet the same is done only for the use of the Parliament, over which neither the Chancery nor any other Court ever had or ought to have any manner of jurisdiction.

From these misinformed positions, most gracious Sovereign, the greatest part of our troubles, distrusts, and jealousies have risen. . . .

# The English Civil War

Maurice Ashley

*The Civil War in England, which broke out in the middle of the seventeenth century, is as controversial among historians as the Thirty Years' War. At the heart of the controversy are two related issues: first, what the balance of religious, political, economic, and social forces was in causing the revolution and civil war; second, what groups or classes can be said to have supported each side. In the following selection, Maurice Ashley, a British historian and journalist, addresses these issues.*

*Consider: How Ashley evaluates the religious and economic causes for the Civil War: how Ashley analyzes the social composition of groups opposing the king.*

What were the causes of the Great Civil War? Oliver Cromwell once said that he had not been convinced at the outset that the causes were religious, but he had come to that conclusion in the end. Superficially religious differences lay at the bottom of everything. . . .

Yet, it still has to be recognized that it was a real shifting of economic power within the community that made the civil war possible. It is significant that Cromwell himself did not at first consider that religion lay at the root of the Civil War. He was right: for it was not the case. Well before Queen Elizabeth died the rise of a vociferous new gentry and the demands uttered in the Commons, which they had reinforced, to express opinions on matters that had never before been their concern showed that the monarchy of the Tudors had ceased to offer an acceptable method of government. As early as 1615 Sir Walter Raleigh had argued that the centre of social gravity had moved and that political power was moving with it. It has even been contended that the position of the gentry before the civil wars had been improved at the expense of the aristocracy which underwent a 'crisis' and that this can be demonstrated statistically, but the argument has been questioned. What is clear is that the Crown was relatively poorer than it had been say a hundred years earlier and consequently weaker. Therefore the Stuart monarchy and its methods of raising revenue were open to attack by well-to-do critics. Outside Parliament the political nation was open to conviction about the need for change. A war of propaganda preceded the civil war. . . .

But it was of course only the upper and middle classes who were sufficiently literate to master this propaganda. Politically it was a one-class society. The mass of the people, the men on the verge of the subsistence level or below it, the people who had been relatively well looked after during the 'Eleven Years' Tyranny', were scarcely involved.

But within the governing classes the divisions of loyalty when the crux came were pronounced if often fortuitous. Up to the time of the Grand Remonstrance the bulk of the members of the House of Commons, including such later stalwart royalists as Edward Hyde, were critical of the King's policies. Afterwards, as a recent examination of the membership of the Long Parliament has disclosed, the House was fairly evenly divided but not along any obvious social or economic lines. Lawyers, country gentlemen, and university graduates were to be found on both sides in almost equal proportions. Among the merchants there were future parliamentarians, while among the King's servants there were future parliamentarians. Yet it is perhaps unwise to draw any general conclusions from the membership of the Commons, for it may not have been a microcosm of the nation. Nevertheless one can point to several county families, for example the Cromwells and Montagues in East Anglia whose different branches ranged themselves on opposite sides in the civil wars. Some broad generalizations, however, appear to hold good. A constitutional revolution in the City of London prevented the King from obtaining the help from the City authorities which previous experiences had led him to expect; and Charles I found many of his adherents in the less commercialized and industrialized parts of the country. Most of the bigger towns, particularly the weaving districts and ports, supported Parliament. Whether, as some historians have argued, the Puritan majority in the House of Commons was able to claim that it was the 'soul' of the kingdom and the arbiter on its 'fundamental laws' because it was conscious of possessing greater economic power and therefore having a right to a larger share in the government or whether — as others suggest — it made the claim because it contained a radical element jealous of the Court has been disputed. Men are sometimes moved by principles, whatever class or party they belong to. But unquestionably the comparative poverty of the monarchy contrasted sharply with the growing wealth of many of the King's subjects who could fairly be called middle class (John Pym and John Hampden were good examples) and this surely was an important factor in the political exuberance of the Commons which led to the civil war.

# The English Revolution, 1688-1689

George Macaulay Trevelyan

In England two blows to monarchical authority proved to be turning points. The first was the Civil War and the execution of Charles I in the 1640s. But although this was a victory for Parliament, the Cromwellian period that followed and the return from exile of Charles II in 1660 cast doubt on the permanence of Parliament's victory. The second was the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688, which removed James II from power without the turmoil of the first revolution. In the following selection, Cambridge historian George Macaulay Trevelyan compares the two revolutions and analyzes the significance of the second one. Following the Whig tradition, Trevelyan views these trends in British history as constructive and progressive. More than most historians, he sees this revolution as an admirable triumph for Parliament.

Consider: Why the second revolution was a more clear-cut victory for Parliament than the first; factors that contributed to the victory of Parliament; how Kingsley Martin might react to the following analysis.

The fundamental question at issue in 1688 had been this — Is the law above the King, or is the King above the law? The interest of Parliament was identified with that of the law, because, undoubtedly, Parliament could alter the law. It followed that, if law stood above the King's will, yet remained alterable by Parliament, Parliament would be the supreme power in the State. Key issue

James II attempted to make the law alterable wholesale by the King. This, if it had been permitted, must have made the King supreme over Parliament, and, in fact, a despot. The events of the winter of 1688-9 gave the victory to the opposite idea, which Chief Justice Coke and Selden had enunciated early in the century, that the King was the chief servant of the law, but not its master; the executant of the law, not its source; the laws should only be alterable by Parliament — Kings, Lords and Commons together. It is this that makes the Revolution the decisive event in the history of the English Constitution. It was decisive because it was never undone, as most of the work of the Cromwellian Revolution had been undone.

It is true that the first Civil War had been fought partly on this same issue: — the Common Law in league with Parliament had, on the field of Naseby, triumphed over the King in the struggle for the supreme place in the Constitution. But the victory of Law and Parliament had, on that occasion, been won only because Puritanism, the strongest religious passion of the hour, had supplied the fighting force. And religious passion very soon confused the Constitutional issue. Puritanism burst the legal bounds and, coupled with militarism, overthrew law and Parliament as well as King. Hence the necessity of the restoration in 1660 of King, law and Parliament together, without any clear definition of their ultimate mutual relations.

Now, in this second crisis of 1688, law and Parliament had on their side not only the Puritan passion, which had greatly declined, but the whole force of Protestant-Anglicanism, which was then at its height, and the rising influence of Latitudinarian scepticism — all arrayed against the weak Roman Catholic interest to which James had attached the political fortunes of the royal cause. The ultimate victor of the seventeenth-century struggle was not Pym or Cromwell, with their Puritan ideals, but Coke and Selden with their secular idea of the supremacy of law. In 1689 the Puritans had to be content with a bare toleration. But law triumphed, and therefore the law-making Parliament triumphed finally over the King.

# memoires: The Aristocracy Undermined in France

Saint-Simon

Louis XIV of France was the most powerful ruler of his time. He had inherited the throne as a child in 1643. He took personal command by 1661, ruling France until his death in 1715. Contemporary rulers viewed him as a model ruler. One of the ways in which he reinforced his position was by conducting a magnificent court life at his palace of Versailles. There, nobles hoping for favors or appointments competed for his attention and increasingly became dependent upon royal whim. One of those nobles, the Duke of Saint-Simon (1675-1755), felt slighted and grew to resent the king. Saint-Simon chronicled life at Versailles in his Memoires. In the following excerpt, he shows how Louis XIV used this court life to his own ends.

Consider: How the king's activities undermined the position of the nobility; the options available to a noble who wanted to maintain or increase his own power; how the king's activities compare with the great elector's recommendations to his son.

Frequent fetes, private walks at Versailles, and excursions were means which the King seized upon in order to single out or to mortify [individuals] by naming the persons who should be there each time, and in order to keep each person assiduous and attentive to pleasing him. He sensed that he lacked by far enough favors to distribute in order to create a continuous effect. Therefore he substituted imaginary favors for real ones, through jealousy—little preferences which were shown daily, and one might say at each moment—[and] through his artfulness. The hopes to which these little preferences and these honors gave birth, and the deference which resulted from them—no one was more ingenious than he in unceasingly inventing these sorts of things. Marly, eventually, was of great use to him in this respect; and Trianon, where everyone, as a matter of fact, could go pay court to him, but where ladies had the honor of eating with him and where they were chosen at each meal; the candlestick which he had held for him each evening at bedtime by a courtier whom he wished to honor, and always from among the most worthy of those present, whom he named aloud upon coming out from saying his prayers.

Louis XIV carefully trained himself to be well informed about what was happening everywhere, in public places, in private homes, in public encounters, in the secrecy of families or of amorous liaisons. Spies and tell tales were countless. They existed in all forms: some who were unaware that their denunciations went as far as [the King], others who knew it; some who wrote him directly by having their letters delivered by routes which he had established for them, and those letters were seen only by him, and always before all other things; and lastly, some others who sometimes spoke to him secretly in his cabinets, by the back passageways. These secret communications broke the necks of an infinity of persons of all social positions, without their ever having been able to discover the cause, often very unjustly, and the King, once warned, never reconsidered, or so rarely that nothing was more [determined]. . . .

In everything he loved splendor, magnificence, profusion. He turned this taste into a maxim for political reasons, and instilled it into his court on all matters. One could please him by throwing oneself into fine food, clothes, retinue, buildings, gambling. These were occasions which enabled him to talk to people. The essence of it was that by this he attempted and succeeded in exhausting everyone by making luxury a virtue, and for certain persons a necessity, and thus he gradually reduced everyone to depending entirely upon his generosity in order to subsist. In this he also found satisfaction for his pride through a court which was superb in all respects, and through a greater confusion which increasingly destroyed natural distinctions. This is an evil which, once introduced, became the internal cancer which is devouring all individuals—because from the court it promptly spread to Paris and into the provinces and the armies, where persons, whatever their position, are considered important only in proportion to the table they lay and their magnificence ever since this unfortunate innovation—which is devouring all individuals, which forces those who are in a position to steal not to restrain themselves from doing so for the most part, in their need to keep up with their expenditures; [a cancer] which is nourished by the confusion of social positions, pride, and even decency, and which by a mad desire to grow keeps constantly increasing, whose consequences are infinite and lead to nothing less than ruin and general upheaval.