

FRAMEWORK FOR MEDIEVAL HISTORY

We have emphasized the importance of breaking history down into periods which allow us to study key personalities, developments, and ideas with greater ease. Our goal is to paraphrase, generalize, and characterize the key elements in the mainstream of human experience to give us a broad overview of the past. That is the purpose of our survey course in Western Civilization!

The periodization of medieval history, our next area of concentration, has been carefully worked out by historians. This chronological breakdown is presented very concisely in the introduction of William F. Cantor's fine text Medieval History — the Life and Death of a Civilization (Macmillan, 1969). As presented below (with some editing), Cantor gives a broad, three-part breakdown, and then a more detailed nine section periodization.

Medieval history can readily be divided into three distinct periods

This division has now become universally accepted and traditional among historians:

(1) 300-1050 — The first of these periods is the very long era from the decline of the Roman Empire to the middle of the 11th century. It is the era in which a distinctive western civilization emerged out of the background — one might almost say the clash — of Christian, Graeco-Roman, and Germanic institutions and ideas. . . .

The early middle ages is the "springtime" of western civilization . . . , a period marked by great chaos and turbulence as western Europe was racked by internal disunity and frequent invasion from without by alien peoples Largely due to the guidance of the church, this incipient European civilization struggled first of all to develop its distinctive ideals; then it faced the more difficult task of developing the necessary institutions to embody and activate these ideals in everyday life.

(2) 1050-1325 — These aims were basically achieved by the end of the 11th century. The result was the remarkable flowering of European art, literature, and philosophy during the 12th and 13th centuries, which together comprised what historians call the high middle ages. More and more research discloses that this extremely fruitful, mature, and stable period was very short-lived, and certainly by the second half of the 13th century the conflict between old ideals and new practices — which gives evidence of a disintegrating civilization — had made its appearance.

(3) 1325-1500 — The result of the dichotomy between ideals and actuality is shown in the 14th and 15th centuries which historians today call the later middle ages and tend to view as the autumn and winter of medieval civilization. In this period western Europe is racked by disorder, pessimism, economic and political decline, until finally at the end of the 15th century the characteristic ideals and institutions of the modern world, based upon the sovereign state, nationalism and individualism, pushes to the fore.

The study of medieval history therefore provides us with an excellent case study of the rise, flowering, and disintegration of a civilization. In the case of medieval Europe such a study is better documented than the history of any other civilization whose evolution has been completed and whose whole pattern of growth, maturity and decay is evident to the student of society and culture.

Then Cantor gives his more detailed, nine-period breakdown of medieval civilization:

(1) 300-400. The first period includes the disintegration of the Mediterranean civilization and the rise of the Christian church. This is the period of the Latin and Christian foundations of medieval civilization.

(2) 400-725. In this period a new, distinct medieval society and government emerged. Included are the Germanic foundations of European civilization and the impact of the Moslem expansion.

(3) 725-900. Cantor characterizes this period as an age of great promise, not entirely fulfilled. This is an era of the coming into existence of the first synthesis of Latin, Christian and Germanic sources to form the First Europe. The characteristics of this First Europe must be examined in comparison with its two competitors among the civilizations of the time, the bordering civilizations of Byzantium and Islam.

(4) 900-1050. The failures of the First Europe are avoided in this successful period of equilibrium and progress. During this era many characteristic European institutions begin to take shape.

(5) 1050-1130. During these next few decades, however, the early medieval equilibrium breaks down largely as a result of a crisis of conscience on the part of several church leaders. The great struggles of this age of the Gregorian reform must be understood as the key turning point in medieval history.

(6) 1130-1200. No sooner had the participants in this struggle given way to a new generation when a new era emerged marked by fantastic expansion in all aspects of life, especially in the areas of piety, humanism, and secular power. These achievements and the remarkable men of the high middle ages who led these advances should be studied in detail.

(7) 1200-1270. By 1200 the consequences of the expansion and acceleration of the 12th century were evident, and a desperate attempt now had to be made by the leaders of European thought and action to bring discordant and conflicting tendencies into a new equilibrium and synthesis. This period was the great age of summing up and organization, rather than creativity.

(8) 1270-1325. The strenuous efforts to avoid crisis and conflict failed, resulting in the disastrous and violent controversies of this next period. Now times were out of joint, and the process of decline and failure was evident.

(9) 1325-1500. The concluding period of medieval history was marked by war, pestilence, economic depression, bitter religious and intellectual controversies, and also by the foreshadowing of the modern world. (Doesn't this sound strangely familiar — like the end of ancient Rome and our modern world today!!!! Is it worthwhile to study history ?)

What you should do is to set aside one sheet of paper for each of these nine periods, and then, as you read the Mainstream text, jot down the key individuals and developments of each of them as you confront them in your study.

This outline is meant to serve you as a guide. Use it!!

THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

In the section "Invaders of the West" (Langer, page 157 new edition, col. one; page 142 old edition, col. two) he has about half a column summarizing 2000 years of history, in actuality! At this point we should refer back to volume two of the Compendium and get much more of a picture than is given here. Sometime later I need to put in the whole archaeological background of this. We need to actually correspond the whole history of Western Europe with the archaeology to get the full story.

At any rate, it is the story of the beginning of a movement in the German-speaking world. It starts out in the German-speaking and I use the term "German-speaking" because not all German-speaking peoples were the same stock. The Anglo-Saxons who went to the British Isles were Germanic-speaking. We could say also that the Franks were. Certainly the Germans were; the Gothic people were. The Norwegians, Danes and Swedes are all Germanic-speaking to this day. And here you have a rather extensive group of people, in reality, of diverse characteristics nationally and culturally speaking. And we have numerous stocks that have lost this identity. Thus the Visigoths in Spain, a certain element in modern Spain, doesn't speak Germanic any longer; the Suevi in Portugal that once were German-speaking do not speak German any longer. Many things have taken place—a language group has lost, due to movement of tribes (like the Lombards in Italy), their background and speak some other language today.

Much of the struggle of the Germanic peoples was between the Huns on the east and the Goths in the central region (the Russian steppes). And the Ural-Altai speaking Huns drove the Germanic-speaking Goths pell-mell into the Roman world. Now here we are actually dealing with a remarkable thing that has never been fully perceived; that is, the extent to which the Huns ultimately joined with the western Germans very heavily, and the Goths joined with the Roman Empire, which was the deciding factor whether the concept of government, organization, culture, and everything that should survive the collapse of Rome would be ROMAN or would be GERMAN! As it turned out, the pattern was ultimately to be ROMAN; but the people who should carry on the pattern or the system were to be GERMAN. This is true because when you look at the struggle, ultimately the Roman Empire was confronted with the dilemma of either having to swallow the German people or to be swallowed by them. And as it happened, the Roman world was ultimately swallowed by the Germans who, when they did so, geographically, became Romanized. Thus, when the Germans swallowed up the Roman world and settled in it, they settled within a cultural Roman area. And the Germans have gradually become Romanized. Therefore we have quite a difference today from the original, ancient German traditions and customs.

The Biblical record very plainly shows that the system of government that should continue to our time was not to be Russian or Chinese or the old tribal German, but was to go right down from Babylon through Persia, Greece, and Rome, and the various continuities of the Roman kind of thinking. That's exactly what ultimately has molded continental Europe. In fact, essentially outside of the English-speaking world we find that all governments in Europe use Roman Law! This is an interesting study in itself. You should read a little something on the subject of ROMAN LAW. You discover that ROMAN LAW is the basis of ALL nations of Europe outside of the common law, English-speaking realm!! Now there may be some that have absorbed a little of the common law concept, but this is the basic pattern.

There is a very interesting book which I would like to recommend called The Blind Eye of History. This is a book well worth your reading. It shows the fact that the nations which have a common law system have invariably had a police force that up to the present has had the respect of the people; where we could have an FBI, and its British counterpart, that is the servant of the state, whereas wherever Roman Law is there is a form of a Gestapo where you have to have some secret police force. This latter is in reference to the modern world; in times past the army was itself used. The Romans had no true POLICE FORCE: When there was civil disobedience, the Romans sent in the army which stamped it out! When trouble broke out, the army moved in and established solitude—otherwise known as Pax Romana! Notice various episodes in the Book of Acts. The Blind Eye of History by Charles Reith, London, 1952. It is a remarkable summary of an area, a blind spot in history, that most have not been aware of!

This material is in relationship to the police force, the state, and the nature of law; and why it is, for instance, that the English people in the British Isles could have a police force where men didn't even have to go around with guns to protect themselves! One of the most remarkable things in the history of any nation!

Back to our main subject: The story, of course, ultimately resolves itself in the collapse of the first German attempt, ^{to organize} under the HUNS, all Germans in northern Europe to take over the Roman world. There were Germans on both sides: Thus it was a question whether the Frankish Germans and the Goths and the Romans should survive; or whether it would be the non-Frankish Germans—Huns and their allies (Sarmatians and the rest)—who would dominate. And, ultimately, it is interesting to see that those German tribes which conquered Germany—that is, organized the whole thing—were, first of all, the Romanized tribes along the Rhineland; that is, the days of Charlemagne—Gaul and on the Rhine, and then the ultimately Romanized Saxons that spread elsewhere.

We discover that in the end it was Roman culture, Roman tradition, the Roman pattern (which the Germans themselves recognized) that formed the basis for the people that were to carry it on. After the defeat of the Assyrian Empire in the east (612 B.C.) it passed to these other nations, but the people who were ultimately to carry it on; finally, when you analyze it, have been the Germans in the West. And this is certainly what Bible prophecy indicates: Wherever this system is it's a Babylonian system. It may involve Chaldeans as a people, but you constantly have the emphasis on ASSHUR or the ASSIRIAN in the latter days!

This is easily demonstrated in looking at the various revivals of the system: Whether it was the Austro-Hungarian Empire it was Germanic dominated; whether it was the old German Holy Roman Empire; whether it was Charlemagne's empire—all were GERMAN dominated! The only real exception was Justinian whose empire was really a continuity of the Roman system reborn in the East. All the others have been dominated by the Germans. The only exception was when both the German realms went under directly—that is, first the German, then the Austrian—and it passed to a Frankish-German union, the 5th revival under Napoleon. But, in reality, it would never have survived, Napoleon could never have done what he did if the Rhineland states had not joined in the system. Mussolini tried it (the 6th resurrection) but he had to have a Hitler to get anywhere. And ultimately, though there will be ten nations in the 7th and final revival in Europe, we're going to see that whatever will be pulled off (and I'm quite sure the Germans will do it on their own), the others are going to discover that they have to go along with it because there is nothing else now economically or militarily they can do!

 Most Americans have learned this Frankish history from French writers and they have never, never realized to what extent the empire of Charlemagne was essentially German and used France as its base, and the Rhineland German states! That's why in German he is called Karl der Grosse. And the capital, Aachen, was in Germany itself which is a surprise to most people who have not made a study of it. They assume it was Paris, but it was not.

 A basic question should be considered: Why were Hitler and Mussolini not crowned by the Pope? Since they were not, how could they represent a true restoration of the Roman system?

The crowning of a ruler by the Pope in former times was due to the fact that the form of government then of the nation was from the top down; and the authority did not come through an election by the people. Therefore, no one was in office unless someone who had authority put him in office! And the only one who claimed the authority and exercised it was the Pope! And he transmitted the authority not by having an election but by putting the crown on a man.

We live in a world, since Napoleon who was not elected by everybody, but in the case of Hitler and Mussolini we have a remarkable change--in other words, since the

beginning of the 19th century in its development—where the idea is that the source of authority is vested in the people and the people elect the ruler—who then are their representatives. Hitler was elected by a certain percentage of the people, and therefore he derived his authority from the people. Now, you see, the Pope has a choice: Either to say all elections are invalid, or that he approves whoever the people elect. Thus the office has been derived from the people and all the Pope has to do is sign a CONCORDAT which recognizes that the elected ruler is in authority—whereas before these men had to be crowned by the Pope who was the one who placed them in office. It's a situation now where there are so many people on earth that the people demanded the right to have their own say—so, and thus the concept of general elections developed. You can't actually say that Mussolini started out with a regular election necessarily but, in reality, he was ultimately approved even in Italy by the Pope—but it was one of those sudden revolutions. Hitler didn't reach the top quite that way. But they ultimately derived it from the consent of the people directly or the consent of some form of parliament which gave its authority to the man who became the Dictator. (As Hitler said, "Give me four years and you will never recognize Germany"—which was right! That was one time he told the truth!)

THE FRANKS AND CHARLEMAGNE

After Justinian's empire withered away the Frankish Kingdom arose (new edition of Langer, pp. 160-161). This Frankish Kingdom was made up of two kinds of Franks: Those who dwelt by the sea—the Salians—and those who dwelt by the riverbank—the Ripuarians. (They got these names later. Undoubtedly there were other origins and names for the two.)

Interestingly enough, this two-fold division ties in directly with what has happened in history since: The SALIAN Franks became FRENCH and the RIPUARIAN Franks became GERMAN. Thus the city of Frankfurt in Germany means "the fort of the German Franks." And the Rhineland is full of German Frankish tribes. Then there is area called Franconia just east of the Rhine. Note that the name "Frank" was preserved in "France" as distinct from the term "Gaul" whereas the name Frank was lost in Germany.

The Pope, in the days of Clovis, chose the Franks of Western Europe to bear the umbrella of civilization when Byzantium shrivelled up to the east. The problem that the Pope did not foresee at the time was this: When he chose the Franks of the West, he was choosing two peoples who at that time were united but who later came to quarrel! He did not choose one people but it looked like it because they all basically spoke the same language. Actually there were two distinct people—two distinct people! And this created quite a problem later on. This is the origin of the struggle between Germany and France to represent civilization in Western Europe! When the Pope chose the Franks, did he choose only the Germans or only the French or both? The French would say, "How could he have chosen both because we're better!" And the Germans, of course, look at it the other way: "How could he have chosen both?—we are the Master Race!" And this, in a nutshell, is the struggle as to who should represent, and who was really chosen, in the original decision when the Pope designated the Franks as the heirs of the Empire in the west.

What we probably have, in part, is that the German Franks certainly represent a number of Assyrian colonies that anciently were in Asia Minor, the Franks or the ancient Phrygians from Asia Minor who came into southeastern Europe after the Third Trojan War and we have their whole history in volume two of the Compendium from that time on. And the Salian line of kings that ruled France (that were the long-haired kings) are, I would suspect, more likely Jewish, and even the bulk of the Franks that went into France, than they are of Reuben. Now there indeed may have been Reubenites but I have stated before that we can easily prove that the House of Judah had gone to Troy, and the Trojan line was Jewish; and the Salian kings were of the same line by literal descent. So the Salian House was Jewish—the royal Salian House was Jewish!! (Called the Merovingians.)

The Riparian Franks were made up of German Hessians or "Hatti"—so-called German Hittites—and other peoples. And these were Assyrian colonies directly out of Asia Minor. Whether, though, there were also Reubenites who had settled along the coast I don't know. I don't know the answer to that because we have no direct history pertaining to it. I would suspect, however, that many Franks are, in fact, Reubenites. But to say that we could prove it other than an indication that they came from the area of the salt sea—hence the word "salian" is applied to them—and how they got there, we don't know the train of events in history.

Now I would draw your attention to pages 162-163 (pp. 148-149 in the old Langer). Here is a story that most are unaware of: The division of the Franks east and west into Austrasia and Neustria. Now, the Eastern Franks represent what we essentially would call the Germanic people as distinct from the French. Here is the House of the Merovingians in the chart on p. 162. A book that is well worth your

reading is entitled The Long-haired Kings by J. M. Wallace-Hadrill—one of the most interesting you could read! It is the story of the struggle for power between the Merovingians and the House of Pepin.

Now the name "Pepin" may sound French but it originally goes back to a Germanic line, in this case with the French name. (After all, though, there are various German words—even the word "Berlin" is Slavic, not German; -in is not a German ending.) Thus Pepin was just a French title. In the chart on 163, the House of Pepin, we go down to Pepin of Heristal, to Charles Martel, then Pepin III, and finally Charlemagne who was the Roman Emperor—Karl der Grosse we call him in German. Most people do not realize that Charlemagne's capital was the city of Aachen (or Aix-la-Chapelle in French). Charlemagne was buried in the famous Aachen Cathedral. The city of Aachen lies within Germany. The average person would never dream that Charlemagne, supposedly a French king, was himself of the Eastern Frankish line. When you see such names as Pepin and Charles Martel, you would never dream that you end up with a man who was plainly German!

In other words, these East Franks were members of a branch that served the French court. They held the office of major-domo or Mayor of the Palace. (The major-domo was the chief official in the household of a king.) From time-to-time they tried to gain control of the French court. But they could not as long as the French Merovingian kings wore long hair! Now the long hair was apparently what guaranteed them their office. And no writer has been able to explain politically why the Merovingians could prevent being overthrown. The answer is there must have been some vow in the past. And as long as they retained long hair, they also retained the kingship. Pepin III wanted to get the kingship so he counselled with the Pope. And the Pope told him how he could get the throne. He said, "The way to get the throne is to cut the Merovingian king's hair. If you cut the hair you get the throne!" Well, how do you cut a man's hair? This was the problem, because you might lose everything in trying to do it. The best way is to get the man to cut his own hair! So Pepin suggested that the King enter a monastery and become a monk—and voluntarily have his hair tonsured. And when he did, he resigned the throne and Pepin took it over! That's how the Germans got control of France—just like that! It's quite a story, one of the most interesting events of the history of the times. It shows to what extent the Pope plays an important part in politics. (See page 183 of volume two of the Compendium: "The Merovingians recognized that though they came from Judah, they were not of the throne of David and would hold their power only so long as they kept a Nazarene tradition—long hair—symbolizing their subjection to a Higher Power—God—who rules supreme among men. (See Numbers 6.)")

The story of the Lombards (page 164 new; 150 old Langer) is the story of a struggle that ultimately came to nothing in Italy. It, however, explains why the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation for so long a time occupied vast areas of Italy: It was due to this large German population in Italy itself. Many of these people have now been absorbed into the Italian population, but they're not Italians in the sense that we think of southern Italians necessarily. Coming from Germany, these Lombards received such names Germano—these were common Italian words applied to Germans that came into the country. So many Germans settled in Italy proper. In fact, as any Italian will tell you who is familiar with Italy, north Italy is more like southern Germany than it is like southern Italy. We might say, then, that no small portion of Italy is made up of Assyrian population that came down as a result of the Lombard invasion.

To summarize: The West Franks were the Salian Franks ruled by the Merovingians (of the House of Judah but not the line of David). Clodion (427 A.D.) founded the Merovingian Dynasty. Clovis (481-511) was its most famous ruler. The East Franks were the Ripuarian Franks ruled by the Carolingians (German). Famous rulers were Charles Martel, Pepin, Charlemagne (771-814).

The story of Charlemagne's Empire is then covered (beginning page 167—153 old Langer), and a picture of how it expanded in Europe. You will discover here quite a story of how the German Franks and the French Franks combined to conquer the region of Austria, much of northern Italy, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, most of Germany, and how long they warred against the Saxons—"a costly and bitter struggle of 30 years" (pp. 167-168; bottom of 153 old edition)—many of the Saxons being Germanic and some, of course, being an Israelite remnant. In many cases you have the story of the various German divisions becoming separate, and many of these Germanic tribes wanting to remain separate. Bavaria submitted readily—no problem there; also the Allemanni. The only ones who held out against the Roman system were the Saxons! Interestingly enough, the Saxons were those who were least influenced by the Roman culture from antiquity. They are the ones later who come to dominate most of Germany; this occurred under the Saxon king Otto who restored the Roman Empire (page 174; 160 in old edition).

Now the rule to follow in studying history—something very interesting in the story of human experience—is as follows: Babylon fell to Persia and Media because, interestingly enough, when Babylon overthrew Assyria she could not do it without Media and Persia (Media especially). When any nation has to combine with another, the usual rule is this: When you have to have another nation as an ally, sooner or later that nation is going to take over you! The Persians couldn't conquer Greece, but the Greeks finally conquered Persia! Then the Greeks conquered everything but Alexander didn't live long enough to conquer the West—so finally Rome conquered all the East! In the end, in the West there developed this Frankish realm that had grown and grown and grown at the expense of Rome—Justinian's restoration did not include most of France. The Franks were separate and Justinian couldn't take over Gaul; he could take over North Africa, a coastal portion of Spain, all of Italy and a little corner of southern Gaul (see the map on page 187; 171 in old Langer). Inevitably the Franks came to prominence!

Later the Franks sought to organize all Germany and barely were able to bring the Saxons in but, at best, they were merely a semi-incorporated people within the realm of Charlemagne's Empire. They finally submitted, but they submitted on terms of near equality! Thus, when the Frankish realm drops to insignificance as a result of splits within it, the interesting thing is that the next House that takes it over is the Saxon House—the one that produced the greatest resistance to the Franks! The origin of the now, Germanic Holy Roman Empire was the House of Otto the Great. So that in the end the Saxons ultimately dominate but in a different kind of unity; their realm didn't include most of France but the central portion of Europe. So we see that the ones who the Franks took so long to conquer ultimately became the dominant element; and they began to spread east and eventually took over Prussia. (Comments on Prussia at this point left out.)

The crowning of Charlemagne by the Pope is mentioned on page 169 (p. 155 old edition). This famous event took place on Xmas Day in 800 A.D. at St. Peter's in Rome. * * * * * The end of the Carolingian line directly seems to occur in 877 with Charles the Bald, the Emperor, whose reign ended in 877. Students often ask when the Empire of Charlemagne began and when it ended: It began in 800 and it seems directly to have ended in 877 after which there was "anarchy and interregnum in the empire" (page 170; 157 old)—the period 877-881. After this point we have only separate divisions or remnants of the Empire in the West. But 877 officially ended its continuity; I think that's the proper ending date for it.

The story continues on page 174 (160 old) with Otto the Great (936-973) who was "crowned and anointed at Aachen, Charlemagne's capital." His coronation banquet of Roman origin included Franconia, Swabia, Lorraine and Bavaria; along with Saxony, Otto's area, we have the five major areas of Germany represented! The coronation by the Pope is given on the next page. (Then note p. 227—213 old—1254-73, THE GREAT INTERREGNUM, end of medieval Holy Roman Empire.)

"Both the French and the German peoples claim Charlemagne as their own and consider him to have been one of their greatest leaders." The reason most of us have the impression he was French is that we have been influenced by French writers!

"Charlemagne was a grandson of Charles Martel who...drove the Moors out of France at the Battle of Tours (732)."

"The name Charlemagne is French but in his lifetime the great king was known by the German name Karl. He was completely German in speech, dress, and ways of living, and he ruled a people almost as completely German as himself."

"The fiercest enemies that Charlemagne ever had to contend with were the Saxons who lived in the northern part of Germany between the Rhine and the Elbe rivers... The Saxon wars went on for more than thirty years....Many treaties were made, but there was no power among the Saxons to make all the tribes follow any agreements. After this had gone on for many years Charlemagne determined to punish the independent Saxons in a manner which all could understand. He ordered that 4500 prisoners be put to death in a single day! This terrible mass murder was the worst thing Charlemagne ever did. Worse still, it did not break the will of the Saxons to go on fighting for their independence." (Now are there any doubts that this man was a German??!!)

Charlemagne was crowned on Xmas Day by the Pope in 800 A.D. while kneeling in prayer before the altar in St. Peter's. Some say this was a complete surprise to him.

Color slide of Charlemagne's Empire: "Charlemagne's empire included all of present-day France, Belgium, Holland and Switzerland. It also included the western part of Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Except for most of Spain and the southern half of Italy, Charlemagne ruled over all the territory of the Western Roman Empire in Europe. Moreover, he ruled large areas north of the Danube and east of the Rhine which were never conquered by the Romans."

Charlemagne (742-814). "The man who led the Franks to victory and so created modern Europe was Charles the Great. In the last resort it is true that national developments are independent of the individual's effort. But without Charles, and the legend of Charles, Europe would have had a different history and a different character. Her civilization would have been more tardily matured, and would have lacked some important elements which it now possesses. Rightly did the cathedral builders of the Middle Ages blazon the exploits of the great emperor upon those buildings which symbolized their highest beliefs and aspirations. Rightly did the Catholic Church inscribe his name in the roll of those who had been foremost in building up the Kingdom of God upon earth [and Catholic prophecies say another Charles will do it in the end]. Nor did the popular tradition err when it saw in him the originator of the Crusading policy which made Christendom the armed camp of the Church militant; when it traced back to him the beginnings of feudalism, of central power hostile to feudalism, of national no less than of imperial aspirations, of the union between State and Church, of the wise jealousy of the state towards the Church. In his policy all these diverse tendencies were co-ordinated and harmonized." From One Hundred Great Lives by Derieux, page 351 (London, 1956), a summary written by H. W. C. Davis.

"The coronation of Charles is not only the central event of the Middle Ages, it is also one of those very few events of which, taking them singly, it may be said that if they had not happened, the history of the world would have been different." From James Bryce, The Holy Roman Empire (London and New York, Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1897), page 50.)

EUROPE: THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

We have a map on page 168 in the new edition of Langer showing Charlemagne's Empire. Though this map does not show us everything we might desire to see, it is nevertheless adequate to illustrate the general picture of the restoration of the Roman Empire during this period.

The Roman Empire Revived

Sometimes people have argued that mistakes have been made, that this is not a revival of the Roman Empire because once you had the Roman Empire and then you have a "Holy" one. I want to bring out this difference in definition. I don't care what they call it, whether they call it holy or not, it's essentially the same system. The "Holy Roman Empire" was not so designated until what we would call the "high" Middle Ages--the 12th century and later [note page 223 under Frederick I Barbarossa]. It was not so designated even under Charlemagne.

The map that is here shows to what extent the original area had its kingdom extend from the Pyrenees well into the Low Countries and much of Germany, and did not include Saxony. The capital was at Aachen as mentioned before. Then it spread to include the Avars in part in the east in Pannonia. The major areas of struggle were in the regions of Saxony.

I want to point out here significant historical parallels to the Frankish struggles with the Saxons. Babylon never did take over Persia and Media--the two had an alliance; and this was the power that ultimately arose to overthrow Babylon! The Greeks were always able to resist the Persians; the Persians could not permanently subdue the Greeks even though they overran the country! In the same way, the Greeks never conquered Rome because Alexander died too soon. And, in turn, it was Rome that absorbed Greece! Then the problems of Rome: The barbarians that lay to the north, the barbarians that lay outside the Roman Empire, in one way or another--whether we think of it as the Arabs who swallowed up the east and the south, whether we think of it as the Germanic people as a whole that swallowed up the north--the Roman Empire was destroyed by those nations that were never absorbed into the Empire, that always had to remain on the periphery because the surrounding world was just too big!

Now when we look at the West, Charlemagne's restoration, interestingly enough, had its greatest warfare with the Saxon Germans. That is, up to this time, remember, the whole Germanic west was divided as to whether it would be pro-Roman or anti-Roman. The Germanic world was divided into these two parts. Remember? One part sided with the Huns, the other part sided with Rome, in the Battle of Chalons in 451 at which time the Huns were defeated (see page 135). The question was this: Shall Germans be Roman or shall they be German in the traditional sense? This was the great problem that divided the country for many years!

At this point the vast area of France, which had been Romanized anyway for a long time, and most of the country in Germany that had also been Romanized became the basis of Charlemagne's realm! Look at the map on page 168. Notice the area that is cross-hatched--how similar it is, not altogether so, but how similar this is to the dimensions of the old Roman Empire as it had existed in this same region. We're not talking about the stippled area where Germanic settlements were much lighter--but if you look in the north, the regions of Bohemia and Saxony were as a whole not ever consistently within the Roman Empire.

So you see that the story of Charlemagne and the Franks who settled within this western portion of the original Roman Empire is really nothing but the story of the Romanized Germans and Gauls! Then there was their expansion into Italy and into the area to the east of Gaul below the Danube—all of this was clearly a part of the old Roman realm. (Spain now, of course, had become Moslem so this was another situation altogether.) But the other areas—Bavaria and Salzburg and the rest—all that was absorbed as a part of the conquests of the realm.

But then there was the struggle centered in the north involving the Saxons! Now these struggles in the north were very important because they showed that sooner or later that area would have to become Romanized or the Germans would be permanently divided. Charlemagne was able to Romanize them (pp. 167-168) but, nevertheless, the area of strength and resistance was always there (just like the strength and resistance to Persia was always in Greece).

The two great powers here are France and Germany; then there is the area in between that is neither French nor German, the countries (peoples) always victimized by the wars between the two big powers. When the realm of Charlemagne broke up into 3 parts, for example, this three-way difference was vividly revealed: One was on the German side, the other on the French side, and the third was in the middle (discussed on page 170 in Langer). It is this middle part that has never been fully understood; it is made up of Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Alsace-Lorraine, Switzerland, and then Italy—that strip in there—made up of people who are, if you please, neither French nor German! (Look at any historical atlas or history text showing the break-up of Charlemagne's Empire.) The French and the Germans have never wanted to recognize this Israelitish "buffer area" between them, but have always wanted to divide up the parts of it between them—you know, the Dutch part can go to Germany while the French want the Belgian part!

The German Empire

When the realm of Charlemagne was divided, out of this Saxon area we have the revival of a truly German Empire (pp. 174, 176). We could say that though Charlemagne was German in his background, the royal family was partly Judaic in the sense of having come from intermarriages with the Trojan line; there were all kinds of inter-relationships just as the Kaiser was related to the royal family of England at the time of World War I and vice-versa.

The point is that up to this time the basic area had been France or Gaul. But beginning with the revival of Otto the Saxon, we could say that the Holy Roman Empire thereafter took on wholly the characteristic of a German language area whereas previous to this it had been a dual language area—Gallic and Germanic. All during the Middle Ages, till the breakdown in the 13th century, it was Germany which was the central core of the Empire. Thereafter it was Austria which was the center. Not until Napoleon did the Holy Roman Empire cease to be essentially centered in a German-speaking area. The whole region had become ultimately Romanized.

Impact of Northern Europe

So, in looking once again at the map on page 168, we see that the Holy Roman Empire now spreads eastward. After this it will cease to be in the regions of Aquitaine and Neustria but will tend to be centered where the stippled area is, and the eastern part of the cross-hatched area, and go into the northern region toward Poland; and then, of course, we will have the story of the Teutonic knights and the

conquest of the region of Estonia, Courland and others (see map on p. 332) so that the German realm will tend to ultimately be centered on the Baltic. And when it is finally concluded, most of the major cities of the Holy Roman Empire will be cities of the Hanseatic League on the Baltic.

Thus the whole source of political power now becomes centered in northern Europe. This is the same time in Scandinavian history that you have the Vikings going east (pp. 185 and 217 fd.). Charlemagne represented the southern power in the 800's while at the same time in the north will be the tremendous expansion of Scandinavia into Iceland, Greenland, ultimately the New World, expansion into Russia with the founding of the Russian state in 859-62 A.D. (see pp. 258-9 in Langer)—all out of Scandinavia! And then there was the coming of the Normans, the revival of the Holy Roman Empire in the 900's, and the expansion of all the cities along the Baltic. The Mediterranean, after all, had been somewhat cut away because the Arabs and the Seljuk Turks controlled most of it having come in from the east. The Mediterranean, by this time, is no longer the center—it is the Baltic and the North Sea, the British Isles if you please; indeed, the North Atlantic where the arms are reaching out, and also toward southern Siberia and into Asia /a reference to Scandinavian expansion—see the summary in column 2 on p. 185/. The climate was excellent. That's why this entire region profited. Later on, however, it became dampened as a result of the "Little Ice Age" of the 13th century (note page 84 of vol. two of the Compendium) when Scandinavia lost contact with the New World. The Scandinavians were driven out of Russia as a result of the rise of the Russian state and the coming of the Tartars from the east. And then there will be a tendency in the Holy Roman Empire to seek a new out through the Arabic world—contact with the east through the Crusades.

Shifts in the Center of Power

Hence instead of Saxon Germany being the dominant center of the Holy Roman Empire, you later will find it shifting much further south into either Prague, which was the capital, or some area in Austria. In other words, later in the Middle Ages when northern Europe ceases to be as dominant, it will shift to Austria. (I'm going way ahead here to give you the overall picture.) And after some period of time in Austria it shifts to the Iberian Peninsula which was under control of the Hapsburgs. Branches of the Hapsburg family will be there; and they will by-pass the north; they will also by-pass the Mediterranean, and will be able to use the Atlantic going to the New World or going around Africa. /For material on the Hapsburg domination see pp. 323-7 and 415-416. Note also the genealogical charts on pp. 324, 427, 721. There are Hapsburg heirs still alive today./

So you have these major shifts in the center of power over the course of history: From the Roman Mediterranean to Gaul and Germany; then from northern Germany, and hence the center of Europe, all the way to the north; and then centering further down in the center of Europe again; then out in the Iberian Peninsula; and then finally in the British Isles and the French coast—which has continued, if you please, until the Second World War; and now it has split so that the center of power has shifted completely out of this region—one in the New World in the United States and the other in the Soviet Union—and presently Western Europe is just a political pawn, a role it will not put up with much longer!

Germanic Push to the East

Now an area that it would be well for you to look into, though good material on it is hard to find, is the story of the expansion of the Holy Roman Empire eastward through Germany toward Poland and into the Baltic—the complete destruction of all

tribes in this region that opposed the expansion of the Holy Roman Empire, the settlement of tens of thousands of people from Germany east—and this is the beginning of the famous expression Drang nach Osten, that is, the push toward the east (note page 229, column one in Langer). As a result of the devastation that hit the Roman Empire, many people—Germanic, Gothic, others—kept coming west and filled in the desolate remains of the Empire (as a result of disease most of the cities had broken down). And then the area began to re-expand, and now the push is east instead of west for some lengthy period of time. And, in fact, it has been east until the end of the Second World War. . . .

France

The expansion of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation will normally be found to include the regions of eastern and northeastern France—Alsace-Lorraine and Burgandy. Not until the Thirty Years' War of 1618-48 was this area so completely devastated that, generally speaking, the French moved into the region and it became linguistically a totally French area. Consequently, as a result of that war in the 17th century, the German realm in Europe shrivelled.

But you really need to understand how much of Europe will be different in this time—regions will be settled by people who do not remain there because they are destroyed in war or migrate in different directions. Hence you will see on the continent that the one nation that continues to increase in size steadily will be France. France will continue to increase in size. In the early days the Holy Roman Empire was the most populous area. By 1780 certainly France was the most populous nation in this part of the world. This explains why France could dominate as she did under Napoleon!

Early Britain

Beginning on page 178 we have a section on "The British Isles." Let me summarize it briefly by saying that much of the story is in volume one of the Compendium in the relationship of Ireland and England. There was the Roman occupation and then the withdrawal of Roman troops in the early 400's (p. 179). This left England open to the ravages from the north out of Scotland. The natives soon called on the Anglo-Saxons to aid the British against the Scottish and especially against the Picts. It turned out that the Anglo-Saxons took it over and drove the Scots and Picts north and drove the Britons out as a whole into Brittany across the Channel (map on p. 209) and scattered them over much of western Europe.

What is important is the expansion out of Denmark into much of England and the formation of the area known as the Danelaw (seen on the map on p. 180). Remember, the Angles and Saxons came out of Schleswig-Holstein. I think we shall see that, in fact, not all of them did; certainly not all of the Saxons. And very, very likely many of the people called "Danes" who entered into the Danelaw in England proper were not really Danes as we know them. In other words, the Danes as we know them who stayed behind in Denmark were different from the Danes who, though living in the area, subsequently moved to England itself. I would suspect that the majority of the people who came into England at this time were actually Angles who had still been remaining in Denmark proper. They tend to settle in this area in England where the Angles had originally been anyway. And many of them will then be driven northward into Scotland and will mix with the Ulster Scots, go into northern Ireland, and from there even to the New World (America).

The Scottish people refer to the English as Saxons, they do not refer to them as Angles—I would call this to your attention—even though the land is called the

Angles (England) today. The fact that the Scottish people do not refer to the English as Angles but as Saxons indicates that very likely the Angles gave their name to New England in America because, in reality, the Angles in England were the primary people who came to America; and they gave their name to England and also to New England. And the people who stayed behind and kept the old name and are now called English are really basically the descendents of the Saxons. This is undoubtedly the indication from history. The overwhelming portion of people in the United States came from such areas as East Anglia which included Norfolk and Suffolk Counties (the "North Folk" and the "South Folk"), Northumbria, and then from Scotland itself.

Justinian's Empire

Now we should take a look at the map on page 186 briefly. This is the Byzantine Empire under Justinian. Remember that in history this is an episode that dates almost 300 years before Charlemagne. Notice that Justinian's restoration out of the east included the absorption of the Bulgars and, of course, Italy; the exclusion of the Visigoths and the Franks; and the occupation only of southern Spain and North Africa; also the exclusion of the Moors who later poured into Spain. So you see, that the Roman Empire at this period in the West hardly touched either Spain or France or Germany. They are left out of this restoration!

When the Roman Empire breaks up after Justinian's death in 565 the Lombards—a pagan, German-speaking tribe out of Czechoslovakia will pour into Italy. This, in fact, resulted in a change in much of the character of northern Italy; it explains why most of northern Italy became a part of the Holy Roman Empire for many, many centuries until the Lombards—after maybe 500 or 600 years—were ultimately absorbed in the Italian linguistic groups. It explains the difference between north and south Italy, the Germanic character of the north. In fact, as many Italians have said, the north Italians and the south Germans are more alike than the north Italians are with the south Italians.

In the West, the only Catholic state that will begin to develop will be the Franks. All the other tribes will be absorbed sooner or later, but they were all Arian! Clovis and the Franks were Catholic—the traditional date of Clovis' conversion to Catholicism is 496 (note page 161, col. two, top). Now this means that when the pagan Lombards came into Italy, the purpose of the Church was to find some power in the West to support the Church because the Byzantine Empire in the East was now too weak! (For background on the developing relationship between the Franks and the Papacy, see pp. 164-67.) So the Church, in fact, ultimately promoted and encouraged the reestablishment of the Roman Empire in the West and had Charlemagne crowned.

The Two Legs of the Image

The crowning of Charlemagne in the West made the emperor in the East at Constantinople very jealous. He wanted to be both legs of the image, so to speak! (For the rulers of this other "leg" of the image see pp. 1306-7 in the Appendix, II. "Byzantine Emperors".) But Charlemagne always acknowledged the eastern ruler as the Emperor of the East, and in the West he ruled. It was the old idea of Rome split into two parts, east and west, as begun by Diocletian about 300 A.D. (refer again to page 131) so that there were always these two branches.

We're going to see this duality far more than I think we realize. The various revivals will represent the revivals that strike the West. In the East the Byzantine Empire continues as the Eastern half while—well, it was also the Western half under

Justinian--but after Justinian it continues as Byzantine in the East and as Charlemagne's realm in the West, then as Byzantine in the East and as the Roman Empire (Saxon House) under Otto in the West--the two legs continuing on down!

Not until later do we have the revival in the West under the Austrians--at which time we are confronted with a significant distinction. The Eastern Empire was ultimately occupied by the Crusades linking the West with the East. But the West thereafter becomes, if you please, when we look at it, split into two parts: One was the Holy Roman Empire, the other being the Hapsburg dynastic lands--most of which lay outside the Holy Roman Empire. So although the Hapsburgs ruled both, there was an empire which was ruled by the Hapsburgs that was called the Empire (yet the Hapsburgs themselves only ruled a tiny portion of that by heredity), but they ruled a large portion of Europe (including Austro-Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Spain) by heredity! Most people are unaware of this continuing duality! (See, for example, a political map of Europe for 1648.)

In the same way, when Napoleon ultimately conquered the Holy Roman Empire and the Hapsburgs, he divided the realm and expanded it and linked up France, the seat of power, with the German states that were his allies. Thus you had two areas, and all maps will show the union of France with the German Rhineland states. (See a map of Europe for 1812.) In the same way later, Italy and Germany were united!

Almost invariably this system has TWO PARTS!! It is a strange thing, but this is just the way it is. There are two parts to it.

The Future

On the basis of this historic-prophetic principle, we could speculate how this duality might be reflected in the coming U. S. of Europe. We do not know exactly how this will develop in the immediate future. We at least know there is going to be iron and clay! And it's very likely that there will be a kind of division even in this coming revival of the Empire that will be obvious and significant. Whether there will be in fact specifically ten nations in one part and other nations joined to it economically by association--this is the way the Common Market is developing--we shall see. We're not told. It may be that, strangely enough, there will only be six in the heart and core; and there may be four others linked by association--making ten in all in the Biblical sense, but still in two parts! I never thought of that before, it just occurred to me now. But in some way there has to be this division, you can see it all through history. That's why the legs are always separate.

Now, maybe, there will be a slight alteration. I don't mean to put any credence on this unless there is a reason: You know, there are five toes on each foot! Just how it will work out or what will happen to Luxemburg--whether there'll be a kind of union there, what's going to happen to the region of Holland and Belgium. There are many struggles occurring right now in Belgium that might split the country. It is very possible that the country could split up if the king should lose power. Then I think the country would. The only thing that's holding Belgium together today is the royal family. If it splits up the one part is linguistically Dutch, the other French. They would almost certainly stay separate--though I don't think they would go along with the French because the Belgians don't like the French. They think the French are lazier than they are! Everybody wants to have somebody to look down upon!

Whatever the case, with this historical background in mind we can watch what happens in Europe. The Holy Roman Empire will be revived!

Modern Israelite Government Institutions Not From Greece and Rome

Ralph Linton has written a book entitled The Tree of Culture which was published some fifteen years ago. It was in his work that I first read the idea expressed by any modern writer that, in reality, the character of all institutions of Northwestern Europe is not to be traced to the Greek and Roman World but is to be traced to the peoples of northern and central Europe from the Middle East.

He said that the actual channel of movement of ideas that we now recognize as traditionally British, American, Scandinavian, even German (as distinct from other ideas that maybe the Germans have and acquired from the Roman world)—in other words, that aspect of civilization which we call democracy, the republican form of government with the concepts that go with it in this part of the Western world, all came from the non-classical world.

And he said that what has tragically happened is that everybody assumes that, since Rome was first a republic and since we now are, all our concepts of thinking are therefore Roman. This is not the case! Just because Greek city-states had democracies and we call ourselves a democracy, this doesn't mean all democratic thought came from Greece. In fact, the Greek democracies were blessed with tyrants! The Roman Republic was blessed with dictators! Now these officials were public benefactors—supposedly! That's why (1) Greece went under and why (2) Rome became an Empire. There was no other solution to the problem.

It is interesting to note that just as Greece broke down and never became a significant empire—I mean, after Alexander was dead it was all gone, and he was a Macedonian anyway from north of Greece—that just as the Greek world shattered, so has the orthodox world of the Greek churches and all the other people shattered. But just as the Romans were able to pick up the pieces of the Republic and build an Empire, so the wretched Samaritan refuse that was spread in the Roman world and took root at Rome was able to create that imperial church that we call the Roman Catholic Church. You will see to what extent Roman and Italian thinking now apparently is applicable only in the religious area but was, in times past, applicable also in the military area.

But a people in northwestern Europe that had these forms of government nevertheless think so differently. The Romans would not recognize our republican institutions as typically Roman. The external form may be somewhat the same, but by no means is the way in which we carry it out. Thus we never think of the Roman Republic or the Greek democracies as responsible government. If you read Roman historians you will see it characterized as generally irresponsible! (Note Matt. 20:25.)

But there is such a thing as responsible government. That is the very thing that, for instance, is lacking (by common consent) over long periods of time in Germany and why the Germans go from the responsible government of the Adenauer era to something that will resemble the Hitler period again.

Craig White

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 or 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.)

THE AGE OF ROYAL ABSOLUTISM
The Politics of Centralized Power — 1650-1775

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1589 — The beginning of French ascendancy (Henry IV) | 1688 — The Glorious Revolution in England |
| 1603 — Beginning of Stuart Monarchy in England (Jas. I) | 1700-1721 — The Great Northern War between Russia and Sweden |
| 1624-1642 — Richelieu in France | 1713-1714 — The Peace of Utrecht |
| 1642-1646 — Cavalier against Roundhead in England | 1713-1740 — Reign of Frederick William I in Prussia |
| 1648-1653 — The Fronde in France | 1740 — War of the Austrian Succession |
| 1653 — The Protectorate est. in England (Cromwell) | 1756 — The Seven Years' War |
| 1660 — The Stuart Restoration in England | 1762-1796 — Catherine the Great in Russia |
| 1661-1715 — Louis XIV rules France | 1763 — The Peace of Paris |
| 1667-1714 — Louis XIV's wars | 1775-1781 — American Revolution |
| | 1789-1799 — French Revolution |

* * * * *

France

Jacques Bossuet (1627-1704)
Henry IV (1589-1610)
Louis XIII (1610-1643)
Richelieu (1624-1642)
Cardinal Mazarin (1642-1661)
Louis XIV (1643-1715)
Fronde (nobles' revolt), 1648-53
Colbert, finance minister (1619-83)
economic policy called mercantilism

England

Elizabeth I (1558-1603)
James I (1603-1625)
1611 — King James Version published
Charles I (1625-1649)
1642-1646 — Cavaliers vs. Roundheads
Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector (1653-58)
1649 — Charles I beheaded
Charles II (1660-1685)
Treaty of Dover, 1670
1672 — declaration of indulgence
Test Act, 1673
Whig and Tory parties form
Habeas Corpus Act (1679)
James II (1685-1688)
Glorious Revolution of 1688
William and Mary (1689-1702)
John Locke (1632-1704)

Russia

Ivan II, the Great (1462-1505)
Ivan IV, the Terrible (1533-1584)
Michael Romanov (1613-1645) begins Romanov dynasty which rules to 1917 (Bolshevik Revolution)

Peter the Great (1682-1725)

1700-1721 — Great Northern War between Russia and Sweden

Catherine the Great (1762-1796)

Brandenburg-Prussia

The Hohenzollerns ---

- (1) Frederick William, the Great Elector (1640-1688)
- (2) Frederick I, King of Prussia (1688-1713)
- (3) Frederick William I (1713-1740)
- (4) Frederick the Great (1740-1768) (this is Frederick II)

Note: You will find these items in the Mainstream text in chapters 19, 20, and 22; also most of them will appear in your chronological outline "Summary of History"