Name \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Chapter 5 State Consolidation and Absolutism**

**Section II: Short Answer Questions**

1. This question asks students to compare the Thirty Years War with the English Civil War, drawing upon content learned in class.
2. Briefly explain ONE important similarity between the Thirty Years War and the English Civil War.

B) Briefly explain ONE important difference between the Thirty Years War and the English Civil War.

C) Briefly analyze ONE factor that accounts for the difference you identified in part B).

A-One important similarity between the Thirty years war and English Civil War was the conflict between the catholic and protestant religion. The Thirty Year War that was fought in many regions of Europe was to establish the principles of Peace of Augsburg which many Monarchs were not following the terms of this Peace treaty. One good example was the fractured Holy Roman Empire. Likewise, in England, the king was leaning towards catholic form of religion by having alliances with catholic nations which was protested by the English parliament who wanted to preserve the protestant puritan form of religion.

B-One important difference was the English Civil war that was a conflict between the English Parliament and their own King in sharing the power while The Thirty years war was a regional conflict between different European states initially to do with religious conflict which later became a conflict to dominance over other states.

C- England was a constitutional Monarchy sharing of power with the parliament but at that time, the Parliament was merely an advisory body with very less power and hence when King Charles I ignored the parliament for example, raising taxes without parliament consent leading to all out English Civil War, hence an internal political struggle. The Thirty Year war on the other hand war between the states with authoritarian flagships, therefore an external struggle.

Source 1

“Absolutism was the wish of the crowds who saw their salvation in the concentration of powers in the hands of one man - the incarnation of the realm, the living symbol of order and of the desired unity. Everyone wished to see in the king the image of God: ‘You are God on earth...’ To this conception was added, with many, the old humanist dream: the king ought to be a hero, lover of glory as in antiquity, protector of Letters...,protector of the Church..., a legislator..., but with a ‘predilection for arms,’ because ‘the role of conqueror is esteemed to be the most noble and highest of titles,’ by all contemporaries.”

-Roland Mousnier, *The XVIth and XVIIth Centuries,* 1954

Source 2

“As an actual political system, absolutism is a myth. The monarchs themselves never regarded themselves as absolute, except in the case of the autocrats of Russia...In practice the system of absolutism seems much more the result of circumstances and personalities than a deliberate intention to revolutionise the whole structure of the state.”

-George Durand, *What is Absolutism?,* 1976

1. Explain ONE major difference between Mousnier’s and Durand’s interpretation of the system of absolutism in European history.
2. Provide ONE piece of evidence from the period 1610-1725 that supports Mousnier’s interpretation (Source 1) and explain HOW it supports the interpretation.
3. Provide ONE piece of evidence from the period 1610-1725 that supports Durand’s interpretation (Source 2) and explain HOW it supports the interpretation.

A-One major difference between Mousnier and Durand’s interpretation of absolutism was Monsuir’s point of view held that the common people were responsible for wanting a ruler as an iconic leader, lord, a representative of God on earth while Durand thought that Absolutism was not really the king having absolute power because he had to depend on his nobles in providing resources for war

B- One piece of evidence would be the king of France Louie IV who declared himself as the Sun King- One King, one law, one faith which was taken well by all his subjects including the nobles without any resistance and adored the idea of him to be their Divine King.

C- One piece of evidence from the period of 1610-1727 would be King Charles I of England who took France’s King Louie IV as his role model and he coined the idea Divine King in order to dominate and ignore the parliament. English civil war is a good example to support Durand’s idea of absolutism was not absolute at all as there was some sharing of power between the king and the parliament.

”With the advent of firearms and subsequent changes in military strategy and tactics, the

professional military came into existence. This new professional army was a standing military

where the members were conscripted, better disciplined and better trained than previous armies.They were also clothed and fed by the government. To maintain such an army, the state had to adapt to the changing circumstances, and there was a huge growth in bureaucracies, treasuries, and economic methods (new methods of taxation and loan financing). [Michael] Roberts believed these adaptations led to the fruition of a powerful modern European state.

Geoffrey Parker has most notably expanded the [military revolution] theory to explain how Europe became the dominant world power that managed to conquer nearly thirty-five percent of the world’s landmass from the period of 1500 to 1800. Parker links the rise of European dominance to three factors: the development of cannons and the arms race that developed between cannons and fortresses, the subsequent rise in the size of armies, and the development of European naval forces. “

Daniel Sok in 2013 discussing the historiography of the military revolution hypothesis of Michael Roberts and expanded on by Geoffrey Parker

1. Identify ONE factor of the military revolution hypothesis promoted by Michael Roberts.
2. Identify ONE factor of the military revolution hypothesis promoted by Geoffrey Parker.
3. Identify ONE impact the military revolution had on the organization of the powerful modern European state.
4. Michael Roberts hypothesis for military revolution included the state having large standing armies permanently employed by feeding them and clothing them in uniforms and on a salary, very much on a professional setting.
5. Geoffrey Parker’s hypothesis was based on the development of sophisticated weaponry and naval ships and those countries who developed the technology and advancement were the dominant states taking over other region through invasion both via land and sea.
6. One significant impact was colonization of Americas. Military revolution made this happen for the Europeans to dominate beyond their continental borders

(Alternate )

1. One significant impact led to Centralization of State , and this state building led to the monarchs’ less dependents on the nobles for providing resources but instead to Monarch took imposing taxes on to newer emerging working lobor population in Europe as well as the emerging merchant class. .

“The kingdom of Prussia first came to prominence in Europe during the early eighteenth century, under the reigns of King Frederick William I (1713-1740), and his son King Frederick II, ‘Frederick the Great’ (1740-1786). Before this period, Prussia’s dominions had formed a loosely-knit agglomeration of territories acquired by dynastic succession, some separated by hundreds of miles from Prussia’s original heartland. Lying geographically in the centre of Europe,unsecured by any natural boundaries, Prussia had always been vulnerable to the kind of invasion and devastation by rapacious foreign armies which she had experienced most catastrophically during the Thirty Years’ War (1618-1648). This conflict inflicted incalculable damage upon her civilian population and infrastructure; in some areas over half of the inhabitants were killed, or died from war-related causes such as malnutrition and disease. As Christopher Clark has noted, the legacy of the repeated occasions when Prussia had stood on the brink of political extinction was ‘an abiding sense of vulnerability that left a distinctive imprint on the state’s political culture’. These occasions not only included the multiple incursions during the Thirty Years’ War, but also those during the Seven Years’ War (1756-1753) and the Napoleonic Wars. In practical terms, this vulnerability led Prussia’s sovereigns to develop her military capabilities to a disproportionate degree relative to her small size, so that she soon possessed one of the most powerful and professionalised standing armies in Europe.”

Helen Roche, Gonville and Caius College, University of Cambridge. 2012

Historians have argued that ‘Prussia is not a state that possesses an army, but rather an army that possesses a state’.

1. Using the excerpt above describe THREE pieces of evidence that support this historical argument.
2. Geographically, Prussia was situated in the center bordering neighboring states who were at times at war with Prussia. This led to having armies situated in borders. Secondly, the Napoleonic invasions, the thirty Years war demanded further building up of army to replace the lost soldiers in battle. This demanded constant recruitment of men in the army and thirdly, epidemics that swept through Prussia again demanded drafting of her people which led to society turning into an army community.