

# HIS 102 (Western Civilization Post 1689)

## TEST I Supplemental Materials



**Mr. Tom Richey,  
Instructor**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Textbook</b>	<b>Supplemental Readings</b>
Jan 15	Foundations of Absolutism in Western Europe	434-435	<b>Document 1.1</b> (Bossuet)
Jan 20	The Age of Louis XIV	436-439	<b>Document 1.2</b> (Duc de Saint-Simon)
Jan 22	Mercantilism vs. <i>Laissez-faire</i>	474-475, 499	<b>Document 1.3</b> (The Candlemakers' Petition)
Jan 27	Absolutism in Central and Eastern Europe	439-440	<b>Document 1.4</b> (Peter the Great)
Jan 29	The Development of English Constitutionalism	447-452	<b>Document 1.5</b> (English Bill of Rights)
Feb 3	English Political Philosophy	434-435	<b>Document 1.6</b> (Hobbes) <b>Document 1.7</b> (Locke)
Feb 5	<b>TEST I / Writing Assignment #1</b>		<b>STUDY GUIDE</b>

# Document 1.1

## From Jacques Benigne Bossuet, *Politics Derived from Holy Writ*

Hanover Historical Texts: <http://history.hanover.edu/courses/excerpts/111boss.html>

We have already seen that all power is of God. The ruler, adds St. Paul, "is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."<sup>1</sup> Rulers then act as the ministers of God and as his lieutenants on earth. It is through them that God exercises his empire... Consequently, as we have seen, the royal throne is not the throne of a man, but the throne of God himself. The Lord "hath chosen Solomon my son to sit upon the throne of the kingdom of the Lord over Israel."<sup>2</sup> And again, "Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord."<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, that no one may assume that the Israelites were peculiar in having kings over them who were established by God, note what is said in Ecclesiasticus: "God has given to every people its ruler, and Israel is manifestly reserved to him." He therefore governs all peoples and gives them their kings, although he governed Israel in a more intimate and obvious manner.

It appears from all this that the person of the king is sacred, and that to attack him in any way is sacrilege. God has the kings anointed by his prophets with the holy unction in like manner as he has bishops and altars anointed. But even without the external application in thus being anointed, they are by their very office the representatives of the divine majesty deputed by Providence for the execution of his purposes. Accordingly God calls Cyrus his anointed. "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him."<sup>4</sup> Kings should be guarded as holy things, and whosoever neglects to protect them is worthy of death. . . .

There is something religious in the respect accorded to a prince. The service of God and the respect for kings are bound together. St. Peter unites these two duties when he says, "Fear God. Honour the king."<sup>5</sup>

...

But kings, although their power comes from on high, as has been said, should not regard themselves as masters of that power to use it at their pleasure ; . . . they must employ it with fear and self-restraint, as a thing coming from God and of which God will demand an account. "Hear, O kings, and take heed, understand, judges of the earth, lend your ears, ye who hold the peoples under your sway, and delight to see the multitude that surround you. It is God who gives you the power. Your strength comes from the Most High, who will question your works and penetrate the depths of your thoughts, for, being ministers of his kingdom, ye have not given righteous judgments nor have ye walked according to his will. He will straightway appear to you in a terrible manner, for to those who command is the heaviest punishment reserved. The humble and the weak shall receive mercy, but the mighty shall be mightily tormented. For God fears not the power of any one, because he made both great and small and he has care for both." . . .

Kings should tremble then as they use the power God has granted them; and let them think how horrible is the sacrilege if they use for evil a power which comes from God....

The royal power is absolute. With the aim of making this truth hateful and insufferable, many writers have tried to confound absolute government with arbitrary government. But no two things could be more unlike....

---

<sup>1</sup> Romans 13:4

<sup>2</sup> 1 Chronicles 28:5

<sup>3</sup> 1 Chronicles 29:23

<sup>4</sup> Isaiah 45:1

<sup>5</sup> 1 Peter 2:17, preceded by "Honour all men. Love the Brotherhood."

I do not call majesty that pomp which surrounds kings or that exterior magnificence which dazzles the vulgar. That is but the reflection of majesty and not majesty itself. Majesty is the image of the grandeur of God in the prince....

God is infinite, God is all. The prince, as prince, is not regarded as a private person: he is a public personage, all the state is in him; the will of all the people is included in his. As all perfection and all strength are united in God, so all the power of individuals is united in the person of the prince. What grandeur that a single man should embody so much!

The power of God makes itself felt in a moment from one extremity of the earth to another. Royal power works at the same time throughout all the realm. It holds all the realm in position, as God holds the earth. Should God withdraw his hand, the earth would fall to pieces; should the king's authority cease in the realm, all would be in confusion.

Look at the prince in his cabinet. Thence go out the orders which cause the magistrates and the captains, the citizens and the soldiers, the provinces and the armies on land and on sea, to work in concert. He is the image of God, who, seated on his throne high in the heavens, makes all nature move....

Finally, let us put together the things so great and so august which we have said about royal authority. Behold an immense people united in a single person; behold this holy power, paternal and absolute; behold the secret cause which governs the whole body of the state, contained in a single head: you see the image of God in the king, and you have the idea of royal majesty. God is holiness itself, goodness itself, and power itself. In these things lies the majesty of God. In the image of these things lies the majesty of the prince....

O kings, exercise your power then boldly, for it is divine and salutary for human kind, but exercise it with humility. You are endowed with it from without. At bottom it leaves you feeble, it leaves you mortal, it leaves you sinners, and charges you before God with a very heavy account.

J.H. Robinson, ed., *Readings in European History* 2 vols. (Boston: Ginn, 1906), 2:273-277.

### QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

1. What is Bossuet's [\*thesis\*](#) (i.e., what point is he trying to make)?
2. What [\*evidence\*](#) does Bossuet use to support his point?
3. According to Bossuet, what is the relationship between God and a king?
4. According to Bossuet, what is the only thing that limits a king's power?

# Document 1.2

## From the Memoirs of the Duc de Saint-Simon

Modern History Sourcebook: <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/17stsimon.html>

### The Court

His natural talents were below mediocrity; but he had a mind capable of improvement, of receiving polish, of assimilating what was best in the minds of others without slavish imitation; and he profited greatly throughout his life from having associated with the ablest and wittiest persons, of both sexes, and of various stations. He entered the world (if I may use such an expression in speaking of a King who had already completed his twenty-third year), at a fortunate moment, for men of distinction abounded... Glory was his passion, but he also liked order and regularity in all things; he was naturally prudent, moderate, and reserved; always master of his tongue and his emotions... He was also naturally kind-hearted and just. God had given him all that was necessary for him to be a good King, perhaps also to be a fairly great one. All his faults were produced by his surroundings. In his childhood he was so much neglected that no one dared go near his rooms. He was often heard to speak of those times with great bitterness; he used to relate how, through the carelessness of his attendants, he was found one evening in the basin of a fountain in the Palais-Royal gardens....

His Ministers, generals, mistresses, and courtiers soon found out his weak point, namely, his love of hearing his own praises. There was nothing he liked so much as flattery, or, to put it more plainly, adulation; the coarser and clumsier it was, the more he relished it. That was the only way to approach him; if he ever took a liking to a man it was invariably due to some lucky stroke of flattery in the first instance, and to indefatigable perseverance in the same line afterwards. His Ministers owed much of their influence to their frequent opportunities for burning incense before him....

It was this love of praise which made it easy for Louis to engage him in serious wars, for he persuaded him that he had greater talents for war than any of his Generals, greater both in design and in execution, and the Generals themselves encouraged him in this notion, to keep in favor with him... He took to himself the credit of their successes... with admirable complacency, and honestly believed that he was all his flatterers told him. Hence arose his fondness for reviews, which he carried so far that his enemies called him, in derision, "the King of reviews"; hence also his liking for sieges, where he could make a cheap parade of bravery, and exhibit his vigilance, forethought, and endurance of fatigue; for his robust constitution enabled him to bear fatigue marvelously; he cared nothing for hunger, heat, cold, or bad weather. He liked also, as he rode through the lines, to hear people praising his dignified bearing and fine appearance on horseback. His campaigns were his favorite topic when talking to his mistresses. He talked well, expressed himself clearly in well-chosen language; and no man could tell a story better. His conversation, even on the most ordinary subjects, was always marked by a certain natural dignity.

His mind was occupied with small things rather than with great, and he delighted in all sorts of petty details, such as the dress and drill of his soldiers; and it was just the same with regard to his building operations, his household, and even his cookery... his Ministers turned it to good account for their own purposes, as soon as they had learnt the art of managing him; they kept his attention engaged with a mass of details, while they contrived to get their own way in more important matters.

His vanity, which was perpetually nourished - for even preachers used to praise him to his face from the pulpit - was the cause of the aggrandizement of his Ministers. He imagined that they were great only through him, mere mouthpieces through which he expressed his will; consequently he made no objection when they gradually encroached on the privileges of the greatest noblemen. He felt that he could at any moment reduce them to their original obscurity; whereas, in the case of a nobleman, though he could make him feel the weight of his displeasure, he could not deprive him or his family of the advantages due to his birth. For this reason he made it a rule never to admit a *seigneur* to his Councils, to which the [Duke de Beauvilliers](#) was the only exception....

But for the fear of the devil, which, by God's grace, never forsook him even in his wildest excesses, he would have caused himself to be worshipped as a deity. He would not have lacked worshippers....

### Life at Versailles

Very early in the reign of Louis XIV the Court was removed from Paris, never to return. The troubles of the minority had given him a dislike to that city; his enforced and surreptitious flight from it still rankled in his memory; he did not consider himself safe there, and thought cabals would be more easily detected if the Court was in the country, where the movements and temporary absences of any of its members would be more easily noticed.... No doubt that he was also influenced by the feeling that he would be regarded with greater awe and veneration when no longer exposed every day to the gaze of the multitude.

His love-affair with Mademoiselle de la Vallière, which at first was covered as far as possible with a veil of mystery, was the cause of frequent excursions to Versailles. This was at that time at small country house, built by Louis XIII to avoid the unpleasant necessity, which had sometimes befallen him, of sleeping at a wretched wayside tavern or in a windmill, when benighted out hunting in the forest of St. Leger.... [Louis] enlarged the *château* by degrees till its immense buildings afforded better accommodation for the Court... The Court was therefore removed to Versailles in 1682, not long before the Queen's death. The new building contained an infinite number of rooms for courtiers, and the King liked the grant of these rooms to be regarded as a coveted privilege.

He availed himself of the frequent festivities at Versailles, and his excursions to other places, as a means of making the courtiers assiduous in their attendance and anxious to please him; for he nominated beforehand those who were to take part in them, and could thus gratify some and inflict a snub on others... It was [a] distinction to hold his candlestick at his *coucher*; as soon as he had finished his prayers he used to name the courtier to whom it was to be handed, always choosing one of the highest rank among those present....

Not only did he expect all persons of distinction to be in continual attendance at Court, but he was quick to notice the absence of those of inferior degree... he used to cast his eyes to right and left; nothing escaped him, he saw everybody. If anyone habitually living at Court absented himself he insisted on knowing the reason... anyone who seldom or never appeared there was certain to incur his displeasure. If asked to bestow a favor on such persons he would reply haughtily: "I do not know him"; of such as rarely presented themselves he would say, "He is a man I never see"; and from these judgments there was no appeal.

He always took great pains to find out what was going on in public places, in society, in private houses, even family secrets, and maintained an immense number of spies and tale-bearers. These were of all sorts; some did not know that their reports were carried to him; others did know it... Many a man in all ranks of life was ruined by these methods, often very unjustly, without ever being able to discover the reason; and when the King had once taken a prejudice against a man, he hardly ever got over it....

No one understood better than Louis XIV the art of enhancing the value of a favor by his manner of bestowing it; he knew how to make the most of a word, a smile, even of a glance...

He loved splendor, magnificence, and profusion in all things, and encouraged similar tastes in his Court; to spend money freely on equipages and buildings, on feasting and at cards, was a sure way to gain his favor, perhaps to obtain the honor of a word from him. Motives of policy had something to do with this; by making expensive habits the fashion, and, for people in a certain position, a necessity, he compelled his courtiers to live beyond their income, and gradually reduced them to depend on his bounty for the means of subsistence. This was a plague which, once introduced, became a scourge to the whole country, for it did not take long to spread to Paris, and thence to the armies and the provinces; so that a man of any position is now estimated entirely according to his expenditure on his table and other luxuries. This folly, sustained by pride and ostentation, has already produced widespread confusion; it threatens to end in nothing short of ruin and a general overthrow.

## Document 1.3

### The Candlemakers' Petition, From *Economic Sophisms* [1845]

Online Library of Liberty: <http://oll.libertyfund.org>

#### Edition used:

*Economic Sophisms*, trans. Arthur Goddard, introduction by Henry Hazlitt (Irvington-on-Hudson: Foundation for Economic Education, 1996).

Author: Frédéric Bastiat      Translator: Arthur Goddard



--

From the Manufacturers of Candles, Tapers, Lanterns, Candlesticks, Street Lamps, Snuffers, and Extinguishers, and from the Producers of Tallow, Oil, Resin, Alcohol, and Generally of Everything Connected with Lighting.

To the Honorable Members of the Chamber of Deputies.

Gentlemen:

You are on the right track. You reject abstract theories and have little regard for abundance and low prices. You concern yourselves mainly with the fate of the producer. You wish to free him from foreign competition, that is, to reserve the *domestic market* for *domestic industry*.

We come to offer you a wonderful opportunity for applying your—what shall we call it? Your theory? No, nothing is more deceptive than theory. Your doctrine? Your system? Your principle? But you dislike doctrines, you have a horror of systems, and, as for principles, you deny that there are any in political economy; therefore we shall call it your practice—your practice without theory and without principle.

We are suffering from the ruinous competition of a foreign rival who apparently works under conditions so far superior to our own for the production of light that he is *flooding* the *domestic market* with it at an incredibly low price; for the moment he appears, our sales cease, all the consumers turn to him, and a branch of French industry whose ramifications are innumerable is all at once reduced to complete stagnation. This rival, which is none other than the sun, is waging war on us so mercilessly that we suspect he is being stirred up against us by perfidious Albion (excellent diplomacy nowadays!), particularly because he has for that haughty island a respect that he does not show for us.<sup>6</sup>

We ask you to be so good as to pass a law requiring the closing of all windows, dormers, skylights, inside and outside shutters, curtains, casements, bull's-eyes, deadlights, and blinds—in short, all openings, holes, chinks, and fissures through which the light of the sun is wont to enter houses, to the detriment of the fair industries with which, we are proud to say, we have endowed the country, a country that cannot, without betraying ingratitude, abandon us today to so unequal a combat.

Be good enough, honorable deputies, to take our request seriously, and do not reject it without at least hearing the reasons that we have to advance in its support.

First, if you shut off as much as possible all access to natural light, and thereby create a need for artificial light, what industry in France will not ultimately be encouraged?

---

<sup>6</sup> ["Perfidious Albion" is England, along with a typically French jibe at the English fog, which keeps the sun from interfering with artificial light in England as much as it does in France. During the 1840's, Franco-English relations were occasionally very tense.—TRANSLATOR.]

If France consumes more tallow, there will have to be more cattle and sheep, and, consequently, we shall see an increase in cleared fields, meat, wool, leather, and especially manure, the basis of all agricultural wealth.

If France consumes more oil, we shall see an expansion in the cultivation of the poppy, the olive, and rapeseed. These rich yet soil-exhausting plants will come at just the right time to enable us to put to profitable use the increased fertility that the breeding of cattle will impart to the land.

Our moors will be covered with resinous trees. Numerous swarms of bees will gather from our mountains the perfumed treasures that today waste their fragrance, like the flowers from which they emanate. Thus, there is not one branch of agriculture that would not undergo a great expansion.

The same holds true of shipping. Thousands of vessels will engage in whaling, and in a short time we shall have a fleet capable of upholding the honor of France and of gratifying the patriotic aspirations of the undersigned petitioners, chandlers, etc.

But what shall we say of the *specialties of Parisian manufacture*? Henceforth you will behold gilding, bronze, and crystal in candlesticks, in lamps, in chandeliers, in candelabra sparkling in spacious emporia compared with which those of today are but stalls.

There is no needy resin-collector on the heights of his sand dunes, no poor miner in the depths of his black pit, who will not receive higher wages and enjoy increased prosperity.

It needs but a little reflection, gentlemen, to be convinced that there is perhaps not one Frenchman, from the wealthy stockholder of the Anzin Company to the humblest vendor of matches, whose condition would not be improved by the success of our petition.

#### **QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:**

1. What is the subject of this essay?
2. What is the author's point of view? What was he trying to accomplish?
3. What style of writing did the author use to make his point?
4. Do you agree or disagree with the author's point?
5. Do you find this essay to be relevant to economic problems that our nation faces today? Explain why or why not?

# Document 1.4

## From Voltaire, *The History of Peter the Great: Emperor of Russia*

Source: [Google Books](#)

### DESCRIPTION OF RUSSIA

THE empire of Russia is the largest in the whole globe, extending from west to east upwards of two thousand common leagues of France,<sup>7</sup> and about eight hundred in its greatest breadth from north to south. It borders upon Poland and the Frozen Sea, and joins to Sweden and China. Its length from the island of Dago, in the westernmost part of Livonia, to its most eastern limits, takes in near one hundred and seventy degrees [almost half the globe], so that when it is noon in the western parts of the empire, it is nearly midnight in the eastern....

The country now comprehended under the name of Russia, or the Russias, is of a greater extent than all the rest of Europe, or than ever the Roman empire was, or that of Darius [of Persia] subdued by Alexander; for it contains upwards of one million one hundred thousand square leagues. Neither the Roman empire, nor that of Alexander, contained more than five hundred and fifty thousand each; and there is not a kingdom in Europe the twelfth part so extensive as the Roman empire; but to make Russia as populous, as plentiful, and as well stored with towns as our southern countries, would require whole ages, and a race of monarchs such as Peter the Great.

The English ambassador, who resided at Petersburg in 1733, and who had been at Madrid, says, in his manuscript relation, that in Spain, which is the least populous state in Europe, there may be reckoned forty persons to every square mile, and in Russia not above five. We shall see in the second chapter, whether this minister was mistaken. Marshal Vauban, the greatest of engineers, and the best of citizens, computes, that, in France, every square mile contains two hundred inhabitants. These calculations are never very exact, but they serve to show the amazing disproportion in the population of two different countries....<sup>8</sup>

Formerly we called Russia by the name of Muscovy, from the city of Moscow, the capital of that empire; and the residence of the grand dukes: but at present the ancient name of Russia prevails....

### PETER'S EUROPEAN TRAVELS

At his return to Amsterdam [Peter] resumed his former occupations, and completed with his own hands, a ship of sixty guns, that he had begun himself, and sent her to Archangel; which was the only port he had at that time on the ocean. He not only engaged in his service several French refugees, Swiss, and Germans; but he also sent all sorts of artists over to Moscow, and he previously made a trial of their several abilities himself. There were few trades or arts which he did not perfectly well understand, in their minutest branches: he took a particular pleasure in correcting with his own hands, the

---

<sup>7</sup> A French league contains three English miles, so multiply all numbers by three to get miles.

<sup>8</sup> From Chapter 2 [Where Voltaire makes his own calculations]:

By the same calculation, it is impossible that the total of the inhabitants of Russia should amount to less than twenty-four millions. At this rate, there are eight persons to every square mile. The English ambassador, whom I have mentioned before, allows only five; but he certainly was not furnished with such faithful memoirs as those with which I have been favoured.

Russia therefore is exactly five times less populous than Spain, but contains near four times the number of inhabitants: it is almost as populous as France or Germany; but, if we consider its vast extent, the number of souls is thirty times less.

geographical maps, which at that time laid down at hazard the positions of the towns and rivers in his vast dominions, then very little known.

He remained at Amsterdam, constantly employed in his usual occupations of shipbuilding, engineering, geography, and the practice of natural philosophy, till the middle of January 1698, and then he set out for England, but still as one of the retinue of his ambassadors.

King William sent his own yacht to meet him, and two ships of war as convoy. In England he observed the same manner of living as at Amsterdam... he took an apartment near the king's dockyard, at Deptford, where he applied himself wholly to gain instruction. The Dutch builders had only taught him their method, and the practical part of shipbuilding. In England he found the art better explained; for there they work according to mathematical proportion. He soon made himself so perfect in this science, that he was able to give lessons to others. He began to build a ship according to the English method of construction, and it proved a prime sailor. The art of watch making, which was already brought to perfection in London, next attracted his attention, and he made himself complete master of the whole theory. Captain Perry, the engineer, who followed him from London to Russia, says, that from the casting of cannon, to the spinning of ropes, there was not any one branch of trade belonging to a ship that he did not minutely observe, and even put his hand to, as often as he came into the places where those trades were carried on.

In order to cultivate his friendship, he was allowed to engage several English artificers into his service, as he had done in Holland; but, over and above artificers, he engaged likewise some mathematicians, which he would not so easily have found in Amsterdam. Ferguson, a Scotchman, an excellent geometrician, entered into his service, and was the first person who brought arithmetic into use in the exchequer in Russia, where before that time, they made use only of the Tartarian [Mongol] method of reckoning, with balls strung upon a wire; a method which supplied the place of writing, but was very perplexing and imperfect, because, after the calculation, there was no method of proving it, in order to discover any error. The Indian ciphers, which are now in use [in Western Europe], were not introduced among us till the ninth century, by Arabs; and they did not make their way into the Russian empire till one thousand years afterwards. Such has been the fate of the arts, to make their progress slowly round the globe. He took with him two young students from a mathematical school, and this was the beginning of the marine academy, founded afterwards by Peter the Great. He observed and calculated eclipses with Ferguson. Perry, the engineer... acknowledges, that Peter made himself a proficient in astronomy; that he perfectly well understood the motions of the heavenly bodies, as well as the laws of gravitation, by which they are directed. This force, now so evidently demonstrated, and before the time of the great Newton so little known, by which all the planets gravitate towards each other, and which retain them in their orbits, was already become familiar to a sovereign of Russia, while other countries amused themselves with imaginary vertices, and, in Galileo's nation, one set of ignorant persons ordered others, as ignorant, to believe the earth to be immoveable....

We must not forget to observe, that a set of English merchants... gave Peter fifteen thousand pounds sterling, for the permission of vending tobacco in Russia. The patriarch, by a mistaken severity, had interdicted this branch of trade; for the Russian church forbade smoking, as an unclean and sinful action. Peter, who knew better things, and who, amongst his many projected changes, meditated a reformation of the church, introduced this commodity of trade into his dominions.

Before Peter left England, he was entertained by King William with a spectacle worthy such a guest: this was a mock sea-fight... William made him a present of the vessel in which he used to go over to Holland, called the Royal Transport, a beautiful yacht, and magnificently adorned. In this vessel Peter returned to Holland the latter end of 1698, taking with him three captains of ships of war, five and twenty captains of merchant ships, forty lieutenants, thirty pilots, as many surgeons, two hundred and fifty gunners, and upwards of three hundred artificers. This little colony of persons skilful in all branches, sailed from Holland to Archangel, on board the Royal Transport, and from thence were distributed into all the different places where their services were necessary. Those who had been engaged at Amsterdam went by the way of Narva, which then belonged to the Swedes...

## THE END OF PETER'S TRAVELS

Peter was ready to set out from Vienna, in order to proceed to Venice, to complete his tour of instruction, when he received the news of a rebellion, which had lately broke out in his dominions.

Tsar Peter, when he left his dominions to set out on his travels, had provided against every incident, even that of rebellion. But the great and serviceable things he had done for his country, proved the very cause of this rebellion.

Certain old boyars, to whom the ancient customs were still dear, and some priests, to whom the new ones appeared little better than sacrilege, began these disturbances... Care was taken to spread abroad the danger to be feared from the introduction of foreigners to instruct the nation. In short, who would believe, that the permission which the czar had given to import tobacco into his empire, contrary to the inclination of the clergy, was one of the chief motives of the insurrection? Superstition, the scourge of every country, yet the darling of the multitude, spread itself from the common people to the [Streltzy](#), who had been scattered on the frontiers of Lithuania: they assembled in a body, and marched towards Moscow, with the intent to place the princess Sophia on the throne, and for ever to prevent the return of a tsar who had violated the established customs, by presuming to travel for instruction among foreigners. [Peter's] forces, commanded by Schein and [Gordon](#), who were much better disciplined than the Streltzy, met them fifteen leagues from Moscow, gave them battle, and entirely defeated them: but this advantage, gained by a foreign general over the ancient militia, among whom were several of the burghers of Moscow, contributed still more to irritate the people.

To quell these tumults, the czar sets out privately from Vienna... and at length arrived at Moscow, where he surprised everyone with his presence: he then confers rewards on the troops who had defeated the Streltzy, (Sept. 1698,) of whom the prisons were now full. If the crimes of these unhappy wretches were great, their punishment was no less so. Their leaders, with several of their officers and priests, were condemned to death; some were broken upon the [wheel](#), and two women were buried alive; upwards of two thousand of the Streltzy were executed, part of whom were hanged round about the walls of the city, and others put to death in different manners, and their dead bodies remained exposed for two days in the high roads, particularly about the monastery where the princesses Sophia and Eudocia resided.<sup>9</sup> Monuments of stone were erected, on which their crimes and punishments were set forth. A great number of them who had wives and children at Moscow, were dispersed with their families into Siberia... This punishment was at least of service to the state, as they helped to cultivate and people a large tract of waste land....

## DESCRIPTION OF ST. PETERSBURG

On the borders of Estonia lies the Gulf of Finland. To the eastward of this sea, and at the junction of the Neva with the lake Ladoga, is situated Petersburg, the most modern and best built city in the whole empire, founded by Tsar Peter, in spite of all the united obstacles which opposed its foundation.

This city is situated on the bay of Kronstat, in the midst of nine rivers, by which its different quarters are divided. In the centre of this city is almost an impregnable fortress, built on an island, formed by the main-stream of the river Neva: seven canals are cut from the rivers, and wash the walls of one of the royal palaces of the admiralty, of the dock-yard for the galleys, and of several buildings of manufactories. Thirty-five large churches contribute to adorn the city; among which five are allotted for foreigners of the Roman Catholic, Calvinist, and Lutheran religions: these are as so many temples raised

---

<sup>9</sup> Captain Perry, in p. 181 of his memoirs, says, that these executions being performed in the depth of winter, their bodies were immediately frozen; those who were beheaded, were ordered to be left in the same posture as when executed, in ranks upon the ground, with their heads lying by them: and those who were hanged round the three walls of the city, were left hanging the whole winter, to the view of the people, till the warm weather began to come on in the spring, when they were taken down and buried together in a pit, to prevent infection. This author adds, that there were other gibbets placed on all the public roads leading to Moscow, where others of these rebels were hanged.

to toleration, and examples to other nations. There are five palaces; the old one, called the summer palace, situated on the river Neva, has a very large and beautiful stone balustrade, which runs all along the river side. The new summer palace near the triumphal gate, is one of the finest pieces of architecture in Europe. The admiralty buildings, the school for cadets, the imperial college, the academy of sciences, the exchange, and the merchants' warehouses, are all magnificent structures, and monuments of taste and public utility... In the environs of the city are several villas or country-seats, which surprise all travelers by their magnificence. There is one in particular which has water-works superior to those of Versailles. There was nothing of all this in 1702, the whole being then an impassable morass.

### **QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:**

1. What did foreign observers note about Russia in terms of its size and population density?
2. By what name had Russia previously been known to Europeans?
3. What subjects did Peter study during his travels in Europe?
4. In what two places did Peter spend most of his time?
5. Of the subjects Peter studied, which interested him the most?
6. Why did Peter have to return to Russia?
7. What powerful groups opposed Peter's reforms? On what grounds did they oppose these reforms?
8. How did Peter respond to the challenges to his authority?

# Document 1.5

## The English Bill of Rights (1689)

An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown

Source: Avalon Project, [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th\\_century/england.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/england.asp)

### PART I: STATEMENT OF GRIEVANCES

Whereas the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons [Parliament] assembled at Westminster, lawfully, fully and freely representing all the estates of the people of this realm, did upon the thirteenth day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred eighty-eight present unto their Majesties, then called and known by the names and style of [William and Mary](#), prince and princess of Orange, being present in their proper persons, a certain declaration in writing made by the said Lords and Commons in the words following, viz.:

**Whereas the late [King James the Second](#), by the assistance of divers evil counsellors, judges and ministers employed by him, did endeavour to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion and the laws and liberties of this kingdom;**

By assuming and exercising a power of dispensing with and suspending of laws and the execution of laws without consent of Parliament;

By committing and prosecuting divers worthy prelates for humbly petitioning to be excused from concurring to the said assumed power;

By issuing and causing to be executed a commission under the great seal for erecting a court called the Court of Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes;

By levying money for and to the use of the Crown by pretence of prerogative for other time and in other manner than the same was granted by Parliament;

By raising and keeping a standing army within this kingdom in time of peace without consent of Parliament, and quartering soldiers contrary to law;

By causing several good subjects being Protestants to be disarmed at the same time when papists were both armed and employed contrary to law;

By violating the freedom of election of members to serve in Parliament;

By prosecutions in the Court of King's Bench for matters and causes cognizable only in Parliament, and by divers other arbitrary and illegal courses;

And whereas of late years partial corrupt and unqualified persons have been returned and served on juries in trials, and particularly divers jurors in trials for high treason which were not freeholders;

And excessive bail hath been required of persons committed in criminal cases to elude the benefit of the laws made for the liberty of the subjects;

And excessive fines have been imposed;

And illegal and cruel punishments inflicted;

And several grants and promises made of fines and forfeitures before any conviction or judgment against the persons upon whom the same were to be levied;

**All which are utterly and directly contrary to the known laws and statutes and freedom of this realm;**

## **PART II: DECLARATION OF RIGHTS**

And whereas the said late King James the Second having abdicated the government and the throne being thereby vacant, his Highness the Prince of Orange (whom it hath pleased Almighty God to make the glorious instrument of delivering this kingdom from popery and arbitrary power) did (by the advice of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and divers principal persons of the Commons) cause letters to be written to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal being Protestants... for the choosing of such persons to represent them as were of right to be sent to Parliament... in order to such an establishment as that their religion, laws and liberties might not again be in danger of being subverted...

**And thereupon the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, pursuant to their respective letters and elections, being now assembled in a full and free representative of this nation... do in the first place (as their ancestors in like case have usually done) for the vindicating and asserting their ancient rights and liberties declare**

That the pretended power of suspending the laws or the execution of laws by regal authority without consent of Parliament is illegal;

That the pretended power of dispensing with laws or the execution of laws by regal authority, as it hath been assumed and exercised of late, is illegal;

That the commission for erecting the late Court of Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes, and all other commissions and courts of like nature, are illegal and pernicious;

That levying money for or to the use of the Crown by pretence of prerogative, without grant of Parliament, for longer time, or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted, is illegal;

That it is the right of the subjects to petition the king, and all commitments and prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal;

That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of Parliament, is against law;

That the subjects which are Protestants may have arms for their defence suitable to their conditions and as allowed by law;

That election of members of Parliament ought to be free;

That the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament;

That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted;

That jurors ought to be duly impanelled and returned, and jurors which pass upon men in trials for high treason ought to be freeholders;

That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction are illegal and void;

And that for redress of all grievances, and for the amending, strengthening and preserving of the laws, Parliaments ought to be held frequently.

### **Religious Restrictions on English Monarchs**

And whereas it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a popish prince, or by any king or queen marrying a papist... all and every person and persons that... shall profess the popish religion, or shall marry a papist, shall be excluded and be forever incapable to inherit, possess or enjoy the crown and government of this realm...

# Document 1.6

## From Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651)

Modern History Sourcebook: <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/hobbes-lev13.html>

**NOTE:** *These excerpts from Leviathan have been paraphrased in order to make the text more readable. Hobbes wrote in Elizabethan English, so his original text reads like Shakespeare or the King James Bible. I have attempted to make the text more readable while preserving Hobbes' message. If you would prefer to read the original text, you may do so by clicking the link above.*

### CHAPTER XIII:

#### OF THE NATURAL CONDITION OF MANKIND AS CONCERNING THEIR FELICITY AND MISERY

NATURE has made men so equal in the talents of body and mind that, though one man is sometimes manifestly stronger in body or of quicker mind than another, yet when all is reckoned together the difference between men is not so considerable as that one man can thereupon claim to himself any benefit to which another may not also claim. For as to the strength of body, the weakest has strength enough to kill the strongest, either by secret machination or by confederacy with others that are in the same danger with himself....

From this equality of ability arise the quality of hope in the attaining of our ends. And therefore if any two men desire the same thing, which they cannot both enjoy, they become enemies; and in the way to their goal, they endeavor to destroy or subdue one another. And from this, it comes to pass that where an invader has no more to fear than another man's single power, if one plant, sow, build, or possess a convenient seat, others may probably be expected to come prepared with forces united to dispossess and deprive him, not only of the **fruit of his labor**, but also of his **life** or **liberty**. And the invader again is in the like danger of another....

Men have no pleasure (but on the contrary a great deal of grief) in keeping company where there is no power able to overawe them all. For every man wants others to value him to the same extent that he values himself, and upon all signs of contempt or undervaluing, he naturally endeavors, as far as he dares, to do damage to those who hold him in contempt, in hopes that others will see the example and fear him.

**So that in the nature of man, we find three principal causes of quarrel: First, competition; secondly, fear;<sup>10</sup> thirdly, glory.**

The first makes men invade for gain; the second, for safety; and the third, for reputation. The first use violence, to make themselves masters of other men's persons, wives, children, and cattle; the second, to defend them; the third, for trifles, as a word, a smile, a different opinion, and any other sign of undervalue, either direct in their persons or by reflection in their kindred, their friends, their nation, their profession, or their name.

**Hereby it is manifest that during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war; and such a war as is of every man against every man...**

the nature of war consists not in actual fighting, but in the known disposition thereto during all the time there is no assurance to the contrary. All other time is peace.

Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of war, where every man is enemy to every man, the same is consequent to the time wherein men live without other security than what their own strength and their own invention shall furnish them withal. In such condition there is no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain: and consequently no culture of the earth... no arts; no letters; no

---

<sup>10</sup> Hobbes uses "diffidence," which can mean fear and/or mistrust. If someone is described as diffident today, it usually means that someone is shy or hesitant

society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and **the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.**

It may seem strange to some man that has not well weighed these things that Nature should thus dissociate and render men apt to invade and destroy one another: and he may therefore, not trusting to this inference, made from the passions, desire perhaps to have the same confirmed by experience. Let him therefore consider with himself: when taking a journey, he arms himself and seeks to go well accompanied; when going to sleep, he locks his doors; when even in his house he locks his chests; and this when he knows there be laws and public officers, armed, to revenge all injuries shall be done him; what opinion he has of his fellow subjects, when he rides armed; of his fellow citizens, when he locks his doors; and of his children, and servants, when he locks his chests. Does he not there as much accuse mankind by his actions as I do by my words? But neither of us accuse man's nature in it. The desires, and other passions of man, are in themselves no sin. No more are the actions that proceed from those passions till they know a law that forbids them; which till laws be made they cannot know, nor can any law be made till they have agreed upon the person that shall make it....

To this war of every man against every man, this also is consequent; that nothing can be unjust. The notions of right and wrong, justice and injustice, have there no place. Where there is no common power, there is no law; where no law, no injustice. Force and fraud are in war the two cardinal virtues. Justice and injustice are none of the faculties neither of the body nor mind. If they were, they might be in a man that were alone in the world, as well as his senses and passions. They are qualities that relate to men in society, not in solitude. It is consequent also to the same condition that there be no propriety, no dominion, no mine and thine distinct; but only that to be every man's that he can get, and for so long as he can keep it. And thus much for the ill condition which man by mere nature is actually placed in; though with a possibility to come out of it, consisting partly in the passions, partly in his reason.

The passions that incline men to peace are: fear of death, desire for a comfortable life, and the hope of attaining a comfortable life by hard work. And reason suggests convenient articles of peace upon which men may be drawn to agreement. These articles are also known as the laws of nature, where of I shall speak more particularly in the two following chapters.

## CHAPTER XIV

### OF THE FIRST AND SECOND NATURAL LAWS, AND OF CONTRACTS

THE **right of nature**, which writers commonly call *jus naturale*, is the liberty each man has to use his own power as he wills himself for the preservation of his own life; and consequently, of doing anything which, in his own judgment and reason, he shall conceive to be means by which to preserve it.

By liberty is understood, according to the proper signification of the word, the absence of external impediments; which impediments may oft take away part of a man's power to do what he would, but cannot hinder him from using the power left him according as his judgment and reason shall dictate to him.

A **law of nature**, *lex naturalis*, is a precept, or general rule, found out by reason, by which a man is forbidden to do anything that would destroy his life, or take away his means of preserving it, or to neglect to do something that he thinks is necessary to preserve it...

And because the condition of man... is a condition of war of every one against everyone, in which case everyone is governed by his own reason, and there is nothing he can make use of that may not be a help unto him in preserving his life against his enemies; it follows that in such a condition every man has a right to everything, even to one another's body. And therefore, as long as this natural right of every man to everything endures, there can be no guarantee that any man, however strong or wise he may be, will live a full life. And consequently it is a precept, or general rule of reason: that every man ought to seek peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it; and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek and use all helps and advantages of war. The first branch of which rule contains the first and fundamental

law of nature, which is: to seek peace and follow it. The second, the sum of the right of nature, which is: by all means we can to defend ourselves.

From this fundamental law of nature, by which men are commanded to seek peace, is derived this second law: that a man be willing, when others are also willing, as far as is necessary for his peace and self-defense, to lay down this right to all things; and be contented with so much liberty against other men as he would allow other men against himself. For as long as every man holds the right to do anything he wants, all men in the condition of war. But if other men are not willing to join him in laying down their rights, then there is no reason for anyone to give up his own rights, for that were to expose himself to harm, which no man is bound to, rather than to dispose himself to peace. This is that law of the gospel, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." And that law of all men, "What you would not wish done to yourself, don't do to another."<sup>11</sup> ....

A right is laid aside, either by simply renouncing it, or by transferring it to another. Someone simply renounces a right when he doesn't benefit from it and doesn't care who exercises it. When he transfers a right, he intends for a certain person or group to benefit from it. Once a man has abandoned a right by renouncing it or transferring it to another, then he is obligated not to hinder those to whom such right is granted, or abandoned, from the benefit of it, and by duty, he ought not to make void his own voluntary act. He has no right to hinder another from exercising the rights he has renounced or transferred... These are the bonds by which men are bound and obligated: bonds that have their strength, not from their own nature (for nothing is more easily broken than a man's word), but from fear of some evil consequence upon the rupture.

Whenever a man transfers his rights, or renounces them, he does so believing that he will receive other rights or some other benefit in return. For it is a voluntary act: and every man who acts voluntarily seeks something good for himself. And therefore there be some rights which no man can be understood by any words, or other signs, to have abandoned or transferred... And lastly, the reason that someone renounces or transfers their rights is to maintain the security of one's person, in his life, and to improve one's quality of life...

The mutual transferring of right is that which men call contract.

---

<sup>11</sup> For the latter phrase, Hobbes used the Latin, "quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris." This variation of the Golden Rule is most often attributed to Confucius, although several ancient philosophers have made similar statements.

# Document 1.7

## From John Locke, *Second Treatise on Government* (1690)

Source: <http://orias.berkeley.edu/summer2004/Final%20Drafts/locke.pdf>

### CHAP. II.: Of the State of Nature.

Sec. 6. . . .The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one: and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions: for men being all the workmanship of one omnipotent, and infinitely wise maker; all the servants of one sovereign master, sent into the world by his order, and about his business; they are his property, whose workmanship they are, made to last during his, not one another's pleasure: and being furnished with like faculties, sharing all in one community of nature, there cannot be supposed any such subordination among us, that may authorize us to destroy one another, as if we were made for one another's uses, as the inferior ranks of creatures are for our's. Every one, as he is bound to preserve himself, and not to quit his station wilfully, so by the like reason, when his own preservation comes not in competition, ought he, as much as he can, to preserve the rest of mankind, and may not, unless it be to do justice on an offender, take away, or impair the life, or what tends to the preservation of the life, the liberty, health, limb, or goods of another....

### CHAP. IX. : Of the Ends of Political Society and Government.

Sec. 123. IF man in the state of nature be so free, as has been said; if he be absolute lord of his own person and possessions, equal to the greatest, and subject to no body, why will he part with his freedom? why will he give up this empire, and subject himself to the dominion and controul of any other power? To which it is obvious to answer, that though in the state of nature he hath such a right, yet the enjoyment of it is very uncertain, and constantly exposed to the invasion of others: for all being kings as much as he, every man his equal, and the greater part no strict observers of equity and justice, the enjoyment of the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very unsecure. This makes him willing to quit a condition, which, however free, is full of fears and continual dangers: and it is not without reason, that he seeks out, and is willing to join in society with others, who are already united, or have a mind to unite, for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties and estates, which I call by the general name, property.

Sec. 124. The great and chief end, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property. To which in the state of nature there are many things wanting. First, There wants an established, settled, known law, received and allowed by common consent to be the standard of right and wrong, and the common measure to decide all controversies between them: for though the law of nature be plain and intelligible to all rational creatures; yet men being biased by their interest, as well as ignorant for want of study of it, are not apt to allow of it as a law binding to them in the application of it to their particular cases.

Sec. 125. Secondly, In the state of nature there [lacks] a known and indifferent judge, with authority to determine all differences according to the established law: for everyone in that state being both judge and executioner of the law of nature, men being partial to themselves, passion and revenge is very apt to carry them too far, and with too much heat, in their own cases; as well as negligence, and unconcernedness, to make them too remiss in other men's.

Sec. 126. Thirdly, In the state of nature there often wants power to back and support the sentence when right, and to give it due execution, They who by any injustice offended, will seldom fail, where they are able, by force to make good their injustice; such resistance many times makes the punishment dangerous, and frequently destructive, to those who attempt it.

Sec. 131. But though men, when they enter into society, give up the equality, liberty, and executive power they had in the state of nature, into the hands of the society, to be so far disposed of by the legislative, as the good of the society shall require; yet it being only with an intention in every one the better to preserve himself, his liberty and property; (for no rational creature can be supposed to change his condition with an intention to be worse) the power of the society, or legislative constituted by them, can never be supposed to extend farther, than the common good; but is obliged to secure every one's property, by providing against those three defects above mentioned, that made the state of nature so unsafe and uneasy. And so whoever has the legislative or supreme power of any common-wealth, is bound to govern by established standing laws, promulgated and known to the people, and not by extemporary decrees; by indifferent and upright judges, who are to decide controversies by those laws; and to employ the force of the community at home, only in the execution of such laws, or abroad to prevent or redress foreign injuries, and secure the community from inroads and invasion. And all this to be directed to no other end, but the peace, safety, and public good of the people.

#### **CHAP. XI. : Of the Extent of the Legislative Power.**

Sec. 134. THE great end of men's entering into society, being the enjoyment of their properties in peace and safety, and the great instrument and means of that being the laws established in that society; the first and fundamental positive law of all commonwealths is the establishing of the legislative power; as the first and fundamental natural law, which is to govern even the legislative itself, is the preservation of the society, and (as far as will consist with the public good) of every person in it. This legislative is not only the supreme power of the common-wealth, but sacred and unalterable in the hands where the community have once placed it; nor can any edict of any body else, in what form soever conceived, or by what power soever backed, have the force and obligation of a law, which has not its sanction from that legislative which the public has chosen and appointed: for without this the law could not have that, which is absolutely necessary to its being a law, the consent of the society, over whom no body can have a power to make laws, but by their own consent, and by authority received from them...

Sec. 135.: . . . The obligations of the law of nature cease not in society, but only in many cases are drawn closer, and have by human laws known penalties annexed to them, to enforce their observation. Thus the law of nature stands as an eternal rule to all men, legislators as well as others. The rules that they make for other men's actions, must, as well as their own and other men's actions, be conformable to the law of nature, i.e. to the will of God, of which that is a declaration, and the fundamental law of nature being the preservation of mankind, no human sanction can be good, or valid against it.

Sec. 137.: for all the power the government has, being only for the good of the society, as it ought not to be arbitrary and at pleasure, so it ought to be exercised by established and promulgated laws; that both the people may know their duty, and be safe and secure within the limits of the law; and the rulers too kept within their bounds, and not be tempted, by the power they have in their hands, to employ it to such purposes, and by such measures, as they would not have known, and own not willingly.

Sec. 138. Thirdly, The supreme power cannot take from any man any part of his property without his own consent: for the preservation of property being the end of government, and that for which men enter into society, it necessarily supposes and requires, that the people should have property, without which they must be supposed to lose that, by entering into society, which was the end for which they entered into it; too gross an absurdity for any man to own.

#### **CHAP. XVIII.: Of Tyranny.**

Sec. 202. Where-ever law ends, tyranny begins, if the law be transgressed to another's harm; and whosoever in authority exceeds the power given him by the law, and makes use of the force he has under his command, to compass that upon the subject, which the law allows not, ceases in that to be a magistrate; and, acting without authority, may be opposed, as any other man, who by force invades the right of another.

**CHAP. XIX.:** Of the Dissolution of Government.

Sec. 212. . . . When any one, or more, shall take upon them to make laws, whom the people have not appointed so to do, they make laws without authority, which the people are not therefore bound to obey; by which means they come again to be out of subjection, and may constitute to themselves a new legislative, as they think best, being in full liberty to resist the force of those, who without authority would impose any thing upon them..

Sec. 222. . . . Whensoever therefore the legislative shall transgress this fundamental rule of society; and either by ambition, fear, folly or corruption, endeavour to grasp themselves, or put into the hands of any other, an absolute power over the lives, liberties, and estates of the people; by this breach of trust they forfeit the power the people had put into their hands for quite contrary ends, and it devolves to the people, who. have a right to resume their original liberty, and, by the establishment of a new legislative, (such as they shall think fit) provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society.

Sec. 225. Secondly, I answer, such revolutions happen not upon every little mismanagement in public affairs. . . . But if [a long train of abuses](#), prevarications and artifices, all tending the same way, make the design visible to the people, and they cannot but feel what they lie under, and see whither they are going; it is not to be wondered, that they should then rouse themselves, and endeavour to put the rule into such hands which may secure to them the ends for which government was at first erected; and without which, ancient names, and specious forms, are so far from being better, that they are much worse, than the state of nature, or pure anarchy; the inconveniencies being all as great and as near, but the remedy farther off and more difficult.

# Graphic Organizer 1.1

## Comparing Hobbes and Locke

Question	HOBBS	LOCKE	Similar or Different?
What is the natural state of mankind before forming a government?			
Why are governments created? From whom do they draw their authority?			
Where does <i>sovereignty</i> reside?			
Can a government's power be limited?			
Do people have the right to overthrow a government? If so, in what cases?			
Put any further analysis you have here:			

# HIS 102

## TEST I STUDY GUIDE

**PART I:**  
**ABSOLUTISM IN WESTERN EUROPE**

**Textbook Correlation:**  
**452-463**

People:	Terms:	
Louis XIV Cardinal Mazarin Henry IV (Bourbon) Duc de Saint-Simon Jacques Bossuet Charles II (Hapsburg) Jean-Baptiste Colbert Adam Smith	Sovereignty Absolutism Constitutionalism Representative Bodies The <i>Fronde</i> "I am the State" "One King, One Law, One Faith" The "Sun King" Service Nobility	Sword vs. Robe Nobles Estates General Huguenots Edict of Nantes Gallicanism Versailles French Classicism War of Spanish Succession Treaty of Utrecht
<b>Questions to Consider:</b>		
<p>How were governments organized in medieval Europe?            What forces kept medieval kings in check?            How did Louis XIV keep the nobility in check?            How did absolutism affect the size of European standing armies?</p>		

**PART II:**  
**MERCANTILISM VS LAISSEZ FAIRE**

**Textbook Correlation:**  
**461-462, 536-537**

People:	Terms:	
Jean-Baptiste Colbert Adam Smith	Economics Bourgeoisie Mercantilism "Zero sum" game Bullion Monopolies Favorable Balance of Trade	Tariffs (Revenue vs. Protective) Subsidies French colonies "Invisible Hand" Competition Absolute Advantage Division of Labor
<b>Questions to Consider:</b>		
<p>What are the goals of a mercantilist economy?            In what ways did Adam Smith challenge mercantilism?</p>		

**PART III:**  
**ABSOLUTISM IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE**

**Textbook Correlation:**  
**465-476**

People:	Terms:	
Frederick William, the Great Elector Frederick William I Ivan III Ivan IV, "the Terrible" Peter the Great Charles XII (of Sweden)	Byzantine Empire Ottoman Empire Janissaries Hapsburg Monarchy Prussia-Brandenburg Junkers Estates Prussian Militarism Russia Boyars	Orthodox Church Mongol Yoke Tsar "Third Rome" Service Nobility Westernization Peter's Absolutism Table of Ranks Peter's Church Reforms Great Northern War Partition of Poland
<b>Questions to Consider:</b>		
What had Frederick William learned from Prussia-Brandenburg's experience in the Thirty Years' War? How did Frederick William and Peter the Great go about increasing their power? What were Peter the Great's motivations for Westernizing Russia? How do the policies of "the Fredericks" of Prussia and Peter the Great compare with those of Louis XIV?		

**PART IV:**  
**THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH CONSTITUTIONALISM**

**Textbook Correlation:**  
**477-483**

People:	Terms:	
Henry VIII Mary I Elizabeth I James I Charles I Oliver Cromwell Charles II (Stuart) James II William and Mary Thomas Hobbes John Locke	Common Law Magna Carta Anglican Church State Religion Stuart Absolutism Religious Uniformity King James Bible Puritans Separatists	Parliament Short/Long Parliaments English Civil War Cavaliers Roundheads Interregnum Restoration English Bill of Rights Natural Rights Religious Toleration
<b>Questions to Consider:</b>		
What are the key differences between absolute and constitutional governments? Why did absolutism fail in England while it was successful on the European continent? What role did religious differences play in the upheavals that occurred in England in the seventeenth century? According to the English Bill of Rights, how had James II violated the liberties of the people? How is Thomas Hobbes' philosophy different from that of the French absolutists? In what ways can the philosophies of John Locke and Thomas Hobbes be compared and contrasted?		

# HIS 102

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

## WRITING ASSIGNMENT #1

### CHOOSE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING PROMPTS:

1. How did **(Louis XIV OR Peter the Great)** go about creating an absolutist state and to what extent was he successful?
2. Compare, contrast, and evaluate the political ideas of Hobbes and Locke.

**SUGGESTED LENGTH: 1.5 - 2 pages** (handwritten)

### Your essay will be graded according to the following criteria:

Clear Thesis  
Organization and Clarity  
Historical Background

Historical Evidence  
Convincing Analysis  
Proper Use of the English Language

### PRE-WRITING:

### THESIS:

---

---

---