

## THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD

### From Henry VIII to the Thirty Years' War

We pick up the story of Europe on page 395 (369 in the old edition of Langer). We come to Henry VIII. His several wives are listed (second column) including Catherine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn, Jane Seymour, Anne of Cleves, Catherine Howard and Catherine Parr—and perhaps others who went unnamed and unwed! The man seems to have had a problem!! It is actually said that he couldn't keep his wives because he had some kind of venereal disease, which I rather suspect is obvious in the story.

The one important fact about Henry VIII is that the Reformation began in England in his day; and he was sponsor of it because the Pope would not approve his divorce from Catherine of Aragon. There are have been various reasons suggested, one of which is that the Catholic Church could have granted it had enough been offered! But Henry was also a little tight-fisted!

Consequently we have the origin, strangely enough, in the Protestant realm of the allowance of adultery as a basis for divorcing. From this time on the Catholic idea of no divorce other than at least some kind of annulment (many of which are not legal in God's sight but are still called that), the idea that you couldn't be divorced if it was a valid marriage, began to break down in the Protestant world. And that's why Protestant morals differ: That is, it's often immorality in the cloak of remarriage rather than in some form of concubinage as you have in the Catholic world.

(The map on pages 370-371 of Europe and Russia in the old edition of Langer is good because it shows the vast plains of Russia in contrast to the mountains of Europe. This helps to graphically explain why movement and migration in Europe is much more restricted. The map on page 397 in the new Langer is much less cluttered but it does not have the mountains.)

On page 398 (370 old edition) we have a paragraph mentioning the excommunication of Henry by the Pope. Then in 1534 the ACT OF SUPREMACY appointed "the king and his successors Protector and ONLY Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England." That's a very important act!

Column two on this page continues the story: In 1539 we find the STATUTE OF THE SIX ARTICLES that laid the foundation for the Church of England. Then in 1542 Ireland becomes a kingdom in the story that develops here within the realm. Also in 1542 there was war with Scotland; James V was defeated by the British (or maybe the word "English" is better). There was this struggle, you see—the Catholics trying to get possession of Scotland and, through Scotland, of England (the Protestants now being in England).

The chart of the English rulers on page 396 (371 old edition) shows to what extent it was not just a father-to-son relationship in every case.

Move to page 399 (372 old edition) and the date 1553 when MARY, a Catholic, married PHILIP who was of SPAIN. "Philip was to have the title of King of England, but no hand in the government, and in case of Mary's death could not succeed her." A number of problems arose and quite a persecution. This was the time (1555) of the death of Ridley, Latimer and Cranmer. "About 300 are said to have been burnt" during this Catholic persecution of Protestants when Catholicism had gotten control of the throne again. Some of these had been the most famous men in England in the days of Henry VIII.

ELIZABETH I (1558-1603), not a daughter of Mary (but of Henry VIII), was "brought up a Protestant." And for this reason, when she came to the throne, there was the adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles (1563). Continuing column two on page 399 (372 old): There was the "Completion of the establishment of the Anglican Church" as distinct from Puritans, Separatists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and others that were developing in England. "Elizabeth...did not 'tolerate' and did 'persecute' Catholics" and others—this was all a part of that form of government, although this persecution amounted to only several dozen people who were executed compared

to hundreds in the days of the previous Catholic regime! This differs widely from Europe where in the Gentile lands often hundreds of thousands met their deaths—or millions before it was all over! In the British Isles it was usually limited in number.

Next we come to the WAR WITH SPAIN (1587). (See page 400—373 in the old Langer—column one.) It was essentially religious because now the Catholics wanted to get control of England now by way of Spain! It was not just Spanish influence alone. If you read carefully I think you will see it was the intent of the Spanish to merely serve the Catholic power and, of course, to obtain possession of England thereby if they could do so.

"The Spanish fleet, called the Invincible Armada...was defeated in the Channel by the English fleet...1588, and destroyed by a storm off the Hebrides." The idea that all Spanish names in Ireland came as the result from refugees of the Armada as it went around Ireland is not true. The question is, Why do we have so many Spanish names in Ireland? I think some can be attributed to this event. But I am quite sure many Spanish names in Ireland do not go back to this but back earlier to the traditional Irish practice of retaining those names that they brought with them out of Spain to start with. There are very many evidences of migration from Spain to Ireland, not of Spaniards but of Irish people who had in fact passed through Spain. This is in all early Irish tradition.

Lesson 52, page 12, of the Correspondance Course has important comments on the significance of events in this period of England's history: "In 1586—87, conviction and execution for conspiracy of Mary, Queen of Scots, removed for the last time the threat to Britain of a Catholic domination by way of the throne. And the following year, as the supposed 'invincible' Spanish Armada approached Britain to attack, it was utterly overwhelmed by a great storm at sea, a miraculous intervention in the weather! And what a miracle it was!

"In that day, it was on the lips of every Englishman and even on those of continentals that this could not have been other than a GREAT MIRACLE from God! Not only was England enabled to remain politically free, she was encouraged to stay non-Catholic!

"The magnitude of this defeat made Europe's strongest Catholic power second-rate. Israelite Britain was now supreme, and in the political and moral climate of a freedom-loving, Protestant Britain, God's Work could again develop." Be sure to read the entire context of this in Lesson 12. It should also be noted that from this point in history on, Spanish colonial power in the New World began to decline rapidly while England's rose—exactly according to God's plan and purpose!

We come to the death of Queen Elizabeth I in 1603—I am skipping over much of Britain's rise in power—and the HOUSE OF STUART which was that branch of the British House ruling in Scotland (they were cousins, ultimately).

We have JAMES I of England (1603—1625) who was James VI of Scotland. From our point of view, he was probably one of the most important kings England had! He was said to have been very backward in the sense that he believed in the divine right of kings and did not believe that Parliament had all of the rights that parliamentarians wanted to acquire.

Actually he was a man who had much better judgment of what the realm ought to be like than others. We have in the library a book, most letters of which are not interesting but others of which are very interesting, entitled The Letters of Queen Elizabeth to King James VI of Scotland—written, of course, before he came to the throne of England in 1603. She writes to him, and she wanted him to come onto the throne—he was the next in line to come to power anyway because she died without children having been unmarried. Part of the reason for this, I think, was that she felt it was better to unite the two countries—you can't fully determine why she never married, from the point of personal preference there might have been reasons. But from the point of view of the government, the very fact that she had no children was part of her own thinking: This for the first time would make it possible to unite England and Scotland and prevent there being a separate country which

could pass into Catholic hands! And this young man, James VI, was a little naive; he trusted men who should not have been trusted. She warned him about that—some of these letters were very interesting even though they seem to be a bit antique and very ambiguous in places.

In 1604 James was "proclaimed King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland" — France only because there was a portion of territory there still ruled by the British.

In 1605 we have the GUNPOWDER PLOT (pages 400-401; 374 in old edition). It was essentially a Catholic plot, though probably it has been blown up out of proportion to its actual importance. However, anything like this could have taken hold and developed into a serious problem.

It is important to realize, though we think of Queen Elizabeth as very important in the history of Britain, that Britain in the time of her reign was next to nothing! We hear a great deal about Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Francis Drake—but these men did not successfully plant any colonies. Oh, Drake got to San Francisco Bay. He made a claim and they have recently found what he had written there, and it does look a little archaic and archaeological in nature—one can hardly read it, it's possible to make out a few words—this monument he set up in San Francisco. We have the establishment of Roanoke, Virginia, a colony that was not permanent, in 1584. But when Queen Elizabeth died there wasn't a single British colony in all of North America, and very little anywhere else around the world. But Britain had made a reputation as a result of these "sea dogs"—this is what they were—attacking the Spanish galleons, like a little snipe at your heels! That's the way the British started out on the sea! So we must realize that at this time Britain's greatness was still in the future. These men like Raleigh and Drake were certainly men of great caliber, there is no doubt about that; but the time of colonizing and spreading abroad had not yet arisen.

We have a wall map showing the extent of manufacturing in the Middle Ages. In various areas of Europe, but especially in Britain, manufacture was developing that had to do with clothing primarily—the manufacture of cloth. It may be said that England was the first country that truly began to INDUSTRIALIZE—that truly began to industrialize! This came as a result of the needs and also the abilities of the people. England was the first truly industrial country. Industry was first done in soft goods. Much time could be spent explaining the method of manufacture: It was usually piece-work done in private homes. It was let out to individuals who would do a certain amount of work and then bring it to collection center. Later on it was done in factories directly. Heavy industry, as we think of it in relation to durable goods, did not take place until the Napoleonic wars.

One of the reasons for Britain's conquest of NAPOLEON was not just control of the sea at all—remember, Britain's control of the sea only prevented Napoleon from conquering England. That's all. That Britain would have retained control of the sea, except for a peculiar circumstance, is in some ways a little dubious. Thus the reason LORD NELSON was so famous for his gaining victory over Napoleon's fleet was the fact that Lord Nelson was a man who didn't belong on the sea! He was always seasick!! And seasick captains are often in the most obvious places! Being a seasick captain where other captain's wouldn't have been around, he happened to have seen an advantage. And it really gets back to the fact that if he had not been sick, he might not have won! Now there are many circumstances like this, and I think the life of Lord Nelson is a good illustration of the uniqueness of the gaining of power over the French or any other people by a nation that normally could never have done so. I think that the story of how the British finally got into Spain and defeated, first of all, the French on the Mediterranean Sea is partly due to this peculiarity that at the very time when the captain usually would have been below he was alone on deck and saw the possibility of gaining an advantage due to the position of the ships—and thus won the victory. This was one of those peculiar circumstances.

So England was able to maintain its power in the days of Napoleon. The naval battle involving Lord Nelson discussed here is the famous BATTLE OF TRAFALGAR of Oct 21, 1805. Note page 640 in the new edition of Langer or page 591 in the old edition "This victory broke the naval power of France and established Britain as the mistress of the seas throughout the 19th century." This one of the most, if not the most, important naval battle ever fought! That little island was able to elude Napoleon's grasp. All of Europe was important, of course, but the trouble was that Napoleon had conquered Europe and all these nations were not his friends or allies. He had to keep them in subjection. In a sense, they were people who wanted to rebel. And this is the advantage the British had because they could just keep the war going—they could say, "We'll continue to be at war with France until Napoleon is finished!" You see, if Napoleon had to feel that the war wasn't over then all the people of Europe could retain the idea that there was still a chance to gain the ultimate victory. And the Czar and the Russians were the ones who perceived how that could be done! (pp. 646-647 in new Langer, 596-597 in old edition, "The French Invasion of Russia.")

We're getting ahead of the story here but it illustrates nevertheless the gradual rise by Britain through sea power and the development of industry. These important factors made Britain economically self-sufficient and put her in a unique position with respect to the MERCANTILE SYSTEM. This is a term you should understand: The Mercantile System is the idea that every nation should import less than it exports thus having more money coming in than going out. It's a nice idea! But, unfortunately, it cannot work in this world unless a nation is able to produce as it should at home—develop your own country, your own wealth.

The story of France in this period ("France, 1483-1641," pp. 409-414 in new Langer, 381-387 in the old edition) is much less interesting and we are not too concerned with the events here except ultimately with the driving out of all the British from any possessions on the continent. The HOUSE OF BOURBON (1589-1792) (page 413 new, 386 old) was originally Huguenot coming from the South (Huguenots were French Protestants), but it became Catholic.

We come to the history of SPAIN in this period. Note page 415 (page 388, old Langer): Remember the story of the Hapsburgs who ruled in Spain. "Charles I of Spain (1516-1556)" was the "founder of the Hapsburg dynasty" in Spain. Read this paragraph carefully under his name. It is important to realize that many wars were fought in Europe over whether or not various nations should have these Catholic Hapsburgs ruling over them.

The rise and fall of Portugal is discussed here (pages 418-420 or 390-392). Sometimes PORTUGAL disappeared as a nation like Poland, and then at other times reappeared! It was always a separate area as far as its population is concerned.

We have various troubles in Italy at this time which are discussed. Notice on 422 (or 394 old edition) the League of Cognac of 1526 and the sack of Rome in 1527. I just mention these points incidentally. Then we have THE PAPACY during this time. We have Innocent VIII who was indolent and corrupt and entirely under the influence of one of his Cardinals (page 422 or 395). We also read about the BORGHIAS. Alexander VI (1492-1503) was of the Borgia family, "a stately, energetic, ruthless, and thoroughly immoral pope, whose life was a scandal even in the Italy of his time." Italy was bad enough, but so bad was the Pope compared to the rest of Italy that he was a scandal!! "The main objective of his policy was to establish the rule of his family in central Italy." Notice that his brother, Caesar Borgia, undertook military conquests in Italy. Read the entire paragraph here. We need not go into further detail. The Borgias were famous for poisoning their enemies.

Then we have the account of ADRIAN VI (1522-1523), the last non-Italian Pope (page 424 or 395-6). It is significant to notice here that, in a sense, from the days of the Protestant Reformation on the Papacy has no longer been European, it's been Italian! This is obvious when you stop to think to what extent the rest of Europe ceased to maintain many of the early traditions and became Protestant or interested in other things such as commerce and trade. From then till now the Popes have all been Italian.

SIXTUS V (1585-1590) is discussed (p. 424; 396 old). He prepared a new edition of the Vulgate Bible (middle of the paragraph about him).

On the next page we have the story of Venice. And then on pages 426-431 (398-403 old edition) is the very important section on "Germany" in this period which is the story of the PROTESTANT REFORMATION. Read these pages very carefully! This is one of the more important sections in the book! Here is the story of Erasmus, Luther, Charles V, John Calvin. And be sure to notice the story of the JESUITS (p. 429 or 401) founded in Spain (1534) by IGNATIUS de LOYOLA—also called the Society of Jesus. The origin of Protestantism is covered here and the reaction against it. Do not overlook the COUNCIL OF TRENT (1545-1563).

Then on pages 431-436 (403-408 in old Langer) is the story of THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR (1618-1648). Read carefully the introductory paragraph of this section which outlines the four different periods or stages of this struggle. The Bohemian and Danish were predominantly religious in character. The Swedish and French-Swedish "were primarily political struggles, wars directed against the power of the Hapsburg house...." The war was primarily "fought on German soil." This long conflict all but wrecked the Holy Roman Empire: After 30 years of war it had become so bad that it is said that the people lived on one another—people were starving to death. Perhaps one third of the population of Germany perished! In this case we do not mean just Germany exclusively but the Holy Roman Empire as a whole which would include portions of Czechoslovakia. But it was so serious that the Holy Roman Empire was nothing but a hollow shell in the end. And this is why Napoleon rose ultimately in France and why no power arose for some time in Germany. And this is why the Germans got the reputation of being good people—the good people of Europe who don't trouble anybody! The country was terribly devastated by this extended conflict. Remember the dates—1618-1648; it began 101 years after Luther commenced the Reformation (1517).

The PRUSSIANS were the people who rose to prominence out of the shambles of this war and taught the Germans self-respect again. It was during much of this period that the Germans spoke in French to one another and in German to their horses!! This is what was said! For a long time it wasn't nice to be a German—just as it wasn't nice after Hitler, you know; this is what they said. Very interesting psychology. The Prussians put a uniform on every man to teach the Germans self-respect again after this terrible devastation. This gives you the feeling of what was taking place in Europe during this time.

Probably the best short version of the Thirty Years' War is to be found in the Britannica. The article there certainly illustrates what the war was like. [The best work in English is The Thirty Years War by C. V. Wedgwood written in the late 1930's and available in the Anchor pocket version put out by Doubleday in 1961.] This would explain why Germany came to be what it is today. This war destroyed the old tradition and broke Germany down altogether. That's why it finally became possible in 1871 to unite Germany and form the German Empire whose architect was the "Iron Chancellor," OTTO VON BISMARCK (see pages 726 fd. or 678 fd. in the old edition—the story of how modern Germany arose). (The above material is taken from the lecture of 4-20-64 by Dr. Hoeh.)