

The Causes of War

Volume III: 1400 CE to 1650 CE

Alexander Gillespie



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2017

Hart Publishing

An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

Hart Publishing Ltd
Kemp House
Chawley Park
Cumnor Hill
Oxford OX2 9PH
UK

Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

www.hartpub.co.uk
www.bloomsbury.com

Published in North America (US and Canada) by
Hart Publishing
c/o International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213-3786
USA

www.isbs.com

**HART PUBLISHING, the Hart/Stag logo, BLOOMSBURY and the
Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc**

First published 2017

© Alexander Gillespie 2017

Alexander Gillespie has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 to
be identified as Author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system,
without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

While every care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of this work, no responsibility for loss or damage
occasioned to any person acting or refraining from action as a result of any statement in it can be
accepted by the authors, editors or publishers.

All UK Government legislation and other public sector information used in the work is Crown Copyright ©. All House of Lords
and House of Commons information used in the work is Parliamentary Copyright ©. This information is reused under the
terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 ([http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/
version/3](http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3)) except where otherwise stated.

All Eur-lex material used in the work is © European Union, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/>, 1998–2017.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-84946-646-2
ePDF: 978-1-50991-766-2
ePub: 978-1-50991-765-5

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Typeset by Compuscript Ltd, Shannon

Printed and bound in Great Britain by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon CR0 4YY

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.hartpublishing.co.uk. Here you will find extracts,
author information, details of forthcoming events and the option to sign up for our newsletters.

VII

The Culmination: The Thirty Years' War

1. INTRODUCTION

DURING MUCH OF the sixteenth century in Europe, the question of war waged for reasons of religion and political balance had caused mass conflicts in Germany, France, England, Scotland, Ireland and parts of what is today the Netherlands. These conflicts over questions of religious and political autonomy culminated in the Thirty Years' War. This war, which was fought primarily in Germany, resulted in the deaths of between seven to eight million people.¹ The lack of precision regarding the numbers results from the fact that it depends on when the counting began and what theatres of war are included. Lower estimates focus on the conflict within Germany between 1618 and 1648. Higher estimates prefer not to see the Thirty Years' War as an isolated and coherent conflict, looking beyond the wars in Germany to include interrelated conflicts, such as those in the Netherlands and northern Europe, and even the distant, but related, fighting ranging from the New World to Africa, as belligerents killed each other over questions of—initially—religion and autonomy before the wars evolved into a conflict between two Catholic superpowers—Bourbon France and the Habsburgs—extending between Spain and Austria.²

2. THE IRONY

The irony of this situation, where religion was one of the key catalysts for mass killing, was that by this time, the influence of the papacy had sunk to its lowest point. In theory, famous Catholic scholars, such as Francesco Suarez, would argue that the Pope, as the supposed promoter of peace within Europe and with binding authority over all Christians

may correct and reform, or may even fittingly punish, a rebellious prince ... [A] Christian king may be deprived of his power and dominion over his vassals; and therefore, [this] is

¹ White, M (2011) *Atrocitology* (NYC, Norton) 215–16.

² Wilson, P (2008) 'The Causes of the Thirty Years' War', *The English Historical Review* 123 (502), 554–86; Thornton, J (2016) 'The Kingdom of Kongo and the Thirty Years' War', *Journal of World History* 27 (2), 189–213; Mortimer, G (2001) 'Did Contemporaries Recognise a Thirty Years' War?', *The English Historical Review* 116 (465), 124–36.

in itself sufficient to endow the Pope with power to punish the Christian princes, lawfully depriving them of their kingdoms and employing for this purpose, the sword of other princes ... for the sake of mutual aid in defending and protecting the Church.³

In reality, Suarez was dreaming of centuries past. In the seventeenth century, the influence of the papacy was in rapid decline. The foremost example of this was the conflict between Pope Paul V and Venice. Venice had allowed foreign diplomats to practise their own religious beliefs, had been inconsistent in enforcing the Index of Prohibited Books and had given sanctuary to two clerics fleeing Rome, the Senate of Venice informing Pope Paul V that the matters at hand were temporal and not spiritual, and therefore that he had no right to make demands. The Pope claimed that such assertions ‘reeked of heresy’ and placed Venice under interdict. The interdict read that the Pope

pronounce[s] excommunicate the Doge and members of the Senate and their supporters and accomplices ... [W]e are moved only by zeal for the honour of the Holy See, the defence of ecclesiastical liberty and jurisdiction, and the salvation of the souls of those who are in the greatest danger on this account.⁴

The Senate then replied:

You must know that we are, every one of us, resolute and ardent to the last degree, not merely the Government but the whole nobility and people of our State. We ignore your excommunication: It is nothing to us. Think of where this resolution would lead, if our example were to be followed by others.⁵

Pope Paul V had to face the terrible truth that the interdict had no impact. The most powerful weapon in the papal armoury—which had brought down kings and emperors centuries earlier—was useless. Thankfully, for the papacy, the French intervened and helped mediate a face-saving outcome over the specifics of the issue, but the overall reality of the situation was lost on no one. The Catholic Church never again issued an interdict against temporal rulers. Thereafter, the Church concentrated on matters over which it had greater control, such as convicting Galileo on vehement suspicion of heresy and sentencing him to ‘formal imprisonment at the pleasure of the Inquisition’.⁶

³ For Suarez, see Scott, J (ed) (1944) *Selections from Three Works of Francisco Suarez*, Vol II (Oxford, Clarendon Press) 697, 701–02; Wright, H (1933) *Francisco Suarez: Addresses in Commemoration of his Contribution to International Law and Politics* (Washington, Catholic University of America) 22; Medina, V (2013) ‘Just War Thinking of Vitoria and Suarez’, *Ratio Juris* 26 (1), 47–64; Skinner, Q (1978) *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Vol II (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) 182–84.

⁴ The ‘Interdict of Pope Paul V, 1606’ in Chambers, D (ed) (2001) *Venice: A Documentary History* (London, University of Toronto Press) 224.

⁵ The Reply from the Senate, as in Norwich, J (2011) *Absolute Monarchs* (London, Random House) 331.

⁶ As quoted in Miller, D (2008) ‘The Thirty Years’ War and the Galileo Affair’, *History of Science* 46 (1), 49–74; Ord, M (2007) ‘Venice and Rome in the First English Embassy to Venice, 1604–1610’, *The Seventeenth Century* 1–23; Bury, J (2007) *Freedom of Thought: A History* (NYC, Prometheus) 70–75.

3. RUDOLF II

Rudolf II, the son of the Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian II, was the King of Hungary, Croatia and Bohemia, and succeeded as Holy Roman Emperor from 1576. His mother was Maria of Spain, a daughter of Charles V and Isabella of Portugal. This made King Philip II of Spain his uncle, and King Philip III his cousin. Philip III was married to Margaret of Austria, the granddaughter of the former Emperor Ferdinand I. This meant that the two parts of the House of Habsburg, in Spain and Austria, were very close.

Rudolf inherited a legacy of decades of peace in Germany, provided by the 1555 *Peace of Augsburg*.⁷ However, by the seventeenth century, the 1555 agreement was beset with three problems. First, it only covered the legal rights of the original adherents to the Augsburg Confession, that is, Lutherans, and not those of equally prominent groups that had evolved subsequently, such as Calvinists. Secondly, the *Ecclesiastical Reservation*, which stipulated that ecclesiastical rulers (such as prince-bishops) must give up their offices and rights (including to real property) should they change religions, was never accepted as binding by most Protestants, and it had never been fully enforced by Emperors after 1555, meaning that thousands of ecclesiastical properties had long been secularised and claimed by Protestant princes, most of whom feared that these lands would be reclaimed. The third, and largest, problem was that the Counter-Reformation was gathering steam. While Germany had been at peace since 1555, the Wars of Religion had swept through France, the Netherlands, England, Scotland and Ireland, before turning full circle.

Rudolf II's support for the Counter-Reformation was all too evident. This Emperor, who had not attended the Reichstag since 1594, and only called it together when he needed money (in 1594, 1597, 1603 and 1608), was interested in seeing how far he could push the Counter-Reformation in Germany. By the turn of the seventeenth century, in cities such as Graz and Vienna, Lutheran establishments were closed down, books were burned and people were ordered to leave. In 1607, Rudolf re-established Roman Catholicism in Donauworth, and then in 1608 a majority of the Imperial Diet decided that the *Peace of Augsburg* should be conditional upon the restoration of all Catholic Church land appropriated since 1552. In response, Frederick IV, the Elector Palatine of the Rhine, orchestrated the formation of a Protestant Union of German states, to defend the rights, lands and persons of each member of the Union. Although the Protestant Union was weak (due to discord between the Lutherans and Calvinists, and the failure of the Protestant Elector of Saxony to participate), the Catholic League was created by the Duke of Bavaria the following year, in 1609.⁸

Rudolf II was not predisposed to conflict and was familiar with the need for compromise. This first occurred in Hungary, where he, through his brother Matthias

⁷ See pages 80–81.

⁸ Daniel, D (1980) 'The Dilemma of the Protestants in the Lands of the Austrian Habsburgs', *Church History* 49 (4), 387–400; Parker, G (1998) *The Thirty Years' War* (London, Routledge) 6–7.

(who had earlier been active in the Netherlands)⁹ made peace with Hungarian Protestant rebels in the *Peace of Vienna* of 1606. In exchange for the rebels accepting Matthias as their king, the religious rights and privileges of the Lutherans and Calvinists in both Hungary and Transylvania were recognised. Rights of the election for independent princes were also recognised in Transylvania.¹⁰

Rudolf II then directed a similar peace in Bohemia, after it appeared that conflict was looming with the Protestants in this region. The Protestants, with their strong (Hussite) traditions of dissent¹¹ and their belief in their 'traditional liberties' and an independent Diet (in which only about 20,000 out of 2 million citizens had political rights, with the majority of the peasants existing in semi-serfdom), had clear differences of opinion with Rudolf over both religion and his desire for more autocratic rule. The specific spark for rebellion was Rudolf's granting of Crown lands to Catholic prelates in Bohemia. Rudolf initially refused to back down, until the Bohemian Diet authorised a levy of 4,500 troops and defeated a force of Rudolf's soldiers who were sent to enforce the Emperor's will. At this point, rather than make matters worse, Rudolf backed down and issued his *Letter of Majesty*. In one of the most liberal charters of the age ever granted to a country of many creeds, Rudolf gave Bohemia limited self-government and confirmed all existing rights. In addition to committing magistrates to ensuring observance of the guarantees, and promising that lords were forbidden to force their subjects to change religion, Rudolf vowed:

That they may be granted all that has been laid down in the Confession, commonly called Bohemian, but by some the Augsburg Confession ... They shall not oppress one another, but remain good friends, not shall one party revile the other ... all citizens shall be allowed to practice their Christian religion ... in all places, and to keep their priests and church regime ... they may freely build their churches and schools and nobody has a right to interfere with them ... We ordain that no existent law, nor any law to be passed in the future, can deprive the present Letter of Majesty of its force.¹²

Rudolf II was succeeded as Holy Roman Emperor by his brother Matthias in 1612. Matthias was also King of Hungary and Bohemia, after his brother ceded the crowns to him. Matthias, who had earlier been so influential in the Netherlands and Hungary, finding a middle ground between the opposing religious sides in the Empire, began to become more conservative. He forbade Protestants the rights of assembly, freedom of speech and to build their churches in certain areas. The Reichstag he called in 1613 broke down following a series of escalating political tensions (such as over the rights of the Emperor; rights of primogeniture; the rights of princes; rights of

⁹ See page 131.

¹⁰ Greengrass, M (2015) *Christendom Destroyed: Europe 1517–1648* (NYC. Penguin) 443–46, 584–85.

¹¹ See pages 63–65.

¹² 'The Letter of Majesty of Rudolf II', reproduced in Reddaway, F (ed) (1930) *Select Documents in European History*, Vol II (London, Methuen) 121; also Zdenk, D (1999) 'Utraquists, Lutherans and the Bohemian Confession of 1575', *Church History* 68 (2), 294–336.

communities), all multiplied through the prisms of different Christian faiths that were becoming endemic throughout an increasingly divided Germany and associated territories.¹³

4. THE REBELLION IN BOHEMIA

Ferdinand II became Holy Roman Emperor in 1619, following the death of his childless cousin, Matthias. Before becoming Emperor, he had been elected King of Bohemia by the Bohemian Diet in 1617 (after promising to uphold the *Letter of Majesty*) and the following year King of Hungary, elected by the Hungarian estates. Ferdinand was a devout Catholic, who believed, despite his promises of tolerance, that it was his mission to restore Catholicism as the only Christian religion. In the areas he controlled he had Protestant books burned, Protestants expelled, appointed Catholic clerics to rule and gave the Church a near monopoly on education. Such goals were not possible to pursue in countries such as Bohemia, as by 1618, the majority of residents of Bohemia had embraced Protestant beliefs in one form or another, and doctrinaire Catholicism had become a distinctly minority religion both in Bohemia and in the surrounding territories of Silesia, Lusatia and Moravia. Ferdinand did not like this and began to interfere directly with Bohemian liberties by the promotion and planting of Jesuits. This interference caused the Bohemians to hold a Diet in the middle of 1618. The meeting, which the Emperor had forbidden to take place, saw the Emperor's regents thrown out of a window (in conscious imitation of an act that had taken place during the Hussite Wars), which act they survived, but their defenestration triggered the start of a war. The Diet then unequivocally asserted the principle of election to the throne and reversed Ferdinand's attempted re-Catholicisation of Bohemia by expelling all Jesuits and seizing Catholic Church property. The members of the Diet explained that they themselves were seeking nothing more than was promised in the *Letter of Majesty*. They told Ferdinand's regents:

[Y]ou are enemies of us and of our religion, [you] have desired to deprive us of our *Letter of Majesty*, [and] have horribly plagued your Protestant subjects ... [If] we lose the *Letter of Majesty* and our religion, all of us would be stripped and deprived of our lives, honour and property, for there can be no justice.¹⁴

The Bohemian rebels then justified their rebellion in 1618 by having their *Apologia* printed throughout Europe. The basis of their claim was that that they had

suffered and endured many and various kinds of terrible hardships and tribulations in both political and ecclesiastic affairs. These were instigated and provoked by evil and turbulent

¹³ Curtis, B (2013) *The Habsburgs: The History of a Dynasty* (London, Bloomsbury) 113.

¹⁴ 'The Defenestration of Prague, 1618' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 14; also Buzek, V (2004) 'From Compromise to Rebellion: Religion and Political Power of the Nobility in the First Century of the Habsburgs' Reign in Bohemia', *Journal of Early Modern History* 8 (1), 1–45.

people, both clergy and laymen, but especially by members of the Jesuit sect ... fraudulently subjugating the *Letter of Majesty* ... [The King's ministers were proceeding] ... without gaining the proper legal authority from the Diet [of Bohemia].¹⁵

The rebels in Bohemia were now joined by the estates of Austria and Moravia, as well as by rogue elements from Ottoman-controlled Transylvania who wanted to fight the Habsburgs. The rebels were supported by the head of the Protestant Union, the Protestant Elector Palatine, Frederick V, the successor to Frederick IV. In an act of clear revolution, after refusing to accept Ferdinand as their hereditary king, the Bohemians created an army of 4,000 men to defend and enforce their claims. They also declared Ferdinand deposed and offered the throne (with restricted rights, and much greater deference to local rights and privileges) to Frederick V. At the same time Ferdinand II began to muster his forces. Although Sigismund III Vasa, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, wanted to join the fight and help his Habsburg in-laws, the Polish *szem* would not allow him to engage. Conversely, Ferdinand's Habsburg cousin in Spain, who sent an army over from Flanders (in exchange for a promise of Alsatian fiefs), was willing to help. So too the Catholic Elector of Bavaria, Maximilian, to whom rewards were offered, to be taken from the conquered Bohemia, along with the promise of his own title's being made hereditary. As these forces were being assembled, those of Bohemia took full control of their area, and twice advanced into Austria, and even bombarded Ferdinand's residence in Vienna, before retreating.¹⁶

5. FREDERICK V

Frederick was the leader of the Protestant Union. In 1613, he had married Elizabeth Stuart, the daughter of King James I of England, at a wedding many saw as a foundation for international Protestant relations. Frederick took this vision seriously, believing that he was God's instrument to further the cause of Protestantism. He accepted the offer from Bohemia to be their king, and was crowned in Prague in late 1619, seeing his decision as a 'divine calling that I must not disobey. My only end is to serve God and his Church'.¹⁷ He added that his decision to accept the crown of Bohemia was also

for the comfort and protection of those who are so greatly distressed, for the maintenance of the common liberty and welfare, for other even more urgent motives and reasons, and in response to the diverse deferential and humble written appeals sent to us by the estates of Bohemia ... [N]o one shall be molested or oppressed on account of religion, nor

¹⁵ 'Apologia of the Bohemian Estates, 1618' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 20; Macartney, C (ed) (1970) *The Habsburg and Hohenzollern Dynasties* (NYC, Harper) 33.

¹⁶ Cooper, J (ed) (1970) *The New Cambridge Modern History: The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years' War*, Vol IV (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) 260, 286, 307–09.

¹⁷ Frederick, as noted in Parker, G (2013) *Global Crisis: War, Climate and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press) 40.

hindered in his traditional religious practice, not even those who still confess to the Roman Church.¹⁸

Such justification for taking the crown, and his promises of religious toleration, did little to convince many of Frederick's cause, as his actions transformed a rebellion in Bohemia into a German, and ultimately international, war. Catholic princes in particular were greatly concerned with how all this might affect their delicate political and religious balance with Protestants in the Holy Roman Empire. That is, with Frederick now having two votes in the electoral college, combined with those of the Calvinist Elector of Brandenburg and the Lutheran Elector of Saxony, the Protestants would in theory now have a majority of the votes, and therefore the next Emperor would likely be Protestant. The Catholic Duke Maximilian I of Bavaria, who went on to lead the Emperor Ferdinand's armies, suggested:

The Bohemian disorders obviously aim at the extermination of the Catholic religion ... [T]he heretical electors and princes in the empire now work to remove the Bohemian crown completely from the House of Austria in order to turn it over to a heretic and thereby gain the majority in the electoral college, so they can then choose a heretical emperor.¹⁹

Emperor Ferdinand II published his version of the struggle in early 1620. He argued that Frederick's acts caused a dangerous precedent, and that the matter should not be seen as one of religion but rather as about private property rights, laws and just punishment. His core argument was that this was an 'odious rebellion under the mantle of religion', as the real issue was that if local estates could elect and depose their own leaders, none of the princes in the Empire would be safe in their possessions. The rebels would face justifiable violence because they had

seized and took up arms, and without the least respect for their absent but duly reigning king and lord, deposed the ... regents and officers from their offices. They then took possession of the regalia of the kingdom and established a completely new form of government ... to their own ends. They far exceeded both the goal and means of the ... *Letter of Majesty* ... They upset all of the fundamental statutes of our kingdom ... and the traditional observances of eight hundred years ... and instead created an entirely new constitution for the kingdom ... We object to all that has been done against us and our house ... but especially the invalid election and coronation undertaken to our detriment ... [W]e hereby, by our imperial and royal authority, abrogate and annul it, proclaiming that all of this is, in itself, illegal, null and void.²⁰

Frederick faced an enemy of 30,000 troops (which included many notable volunteers, such as the philosopher Descartes), who marched into Upper Austria under the

¹⁸ 'Declaration of Elector Frederick V' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 78; also, Chovanec, K (2015) 'The British Pharaoh? James I and VI and Internationalist Religious Writings at the Wedding of Frederick V and Elizabeth Stuart', *The Seventeenth Century* 30 (4), 391–409.

¹⁹ Maximilian I, in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 7.

²⁰ 'Edict of Ferdinand II Annulling the Bohemian Election, 1620' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 39.

leadership of General Tilly. This force crushed the rebels in Austria. John George of Saxony seized Lusatia and Silesia; and the Spanish army in Flanders advanced and overwhelmed most of Frederick's lands in the Rhine Palatinate. At the Battle of White Mountain towards the end of 1620, the imperial army of over 24,000 men advanced towards Prague. The army of 16,000 Protestant rebels stood in their way for a short time before it was destroyed, leaving at least 4,000 dead on the battlefield. The imperialists reclaimed Prague. Ferdinand II refused to engage in peace talks, stating that there was 'nothing more to be gained from treaties ... complete obedience from his subjects could only be assured by the sword'.²¹

Frederick gained almost nothing from his pleas for assistance from the outside Protestant world. Within Germany, even the Lutheran ruler of Saxony, John George, horrified at Frederick's blatant disregard for the maintenance of peace in the Empire, decided to join the Emperor Ferdinand's side. In exchange for his help, the Emperor promised that Lutheranism would be protected in Saxony and Bohemia, secularised lands would not be reclaimed as Catholic and the province of Lusatia would be granted to John George. The other Protestant rulers were equally unwilling to join the fight. Their collective response was the *Treaty of Ulm*, in which they (as the Protestant League) agreed with the Catholic League, to try to keep the conflict isolated. Both sides would uphold the *Peace of Augsburg* everywhere else, and in exchange for Protestant neutrality, other Protestant lands would not be invaded in the conflict and Frederick would not be deprived of his hereditary lands in the Palatinate if he lost (in other words, although Frederick might be defeated, his punishment would not involve the loss of his heritage). Neither of these terms was kept.²²

The following year, in 1621, the Spanish arm of the Habsburgs struck quickly as the *Twelve Years' Truce*²³ between the Dutch and the Spanish came to an end. The new King of Spain, Philip IV, carried on the war of his father and grandfather, acting without restraint as he viewed the Dutch as aggressors who had kept up their attacks on the overseas empires of Spain and Portugal during the Truce, and who had kept tight their stranglehold on the Spanish Netherlands. Hence, Spain went back to war not to reconquer its lost Dutch provinces but to defend its economic and temporal interests. Spanish forces captured Breda in 1625. This last great Spanish victory in the Dutch Revolt cost the defenders at least 13,000 civilians and soldiers, with Spanish losses amounting to some 5,000 out of 23,000.

As the Spanish Habsburgs made advances, the Austrian Habsburgs pursued Frederick's remaining Protestant forces. The rebels suffered further massive defeats at Fleurus in 1622 (a further 5,000 dead) and Stadtlohn in 1623 (6,000 dead and 4,000 made prisoner). Although Frederick escaped with his life, fleeing to the Dutch Republic, those remaining in Bohemia and responsible for the defenestration of the

²¹ Ferdinand, in Parker, G (1998) *The Thirty Years' War* (London, Routledge) 54–55; also Reiss, T (1991) 'Descartes and the Thirty Years' War: Political Theory and Political Practice', *Yale French Studies* 80, 108–45.

²² 'The 1620 Treaty of Ulm' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 46; Friedrich, C (1952) *The Age of the Baroque* (NYC, Harper) 152, 165–66.

²³ See pages 134–135.

Emperor's regents were publicly executed. A further 1,500 were brought to trial, and at least half had their property confiscated. Elective monarchy was abolished in Bohemia, the *Letter of Majesty* was torn up, and in accordance with the principle *Cuius region, eius religio* ('whose realm, his religion') set out in the 1555 *Peace of Augsburg*,²⁴ Catholicism was reintroduced throughout those lands as Protestantism was suppressed. Protestants could either convert or leave (with the exception of nobles, who had 50 years in which to change their faith). Frederick's capital of Heidelberg succumbed to General Tilly in the middle of 1621. The town was brutally sacked, with its famous library being given to the papacy as a gift. Such heavy-handed actions troubled Catholics and Protestants alike. They feared that Frederick's removal was a vast transgression of the Emperor's power. In the words of the Elector of Saxony, they saw their status 'afflicted by a not inconsiderable assault' from the Emperor, and they began to reconsider their loyalty.²⁵ Such fears were deepened even more when, in 1627, Ferdinand II gave Bohemia a new constitution that made the Habsburgs hereditary, rather than elective, monarchs; making the king the sole authority over all civil servants; and moving the main governmental office to Vienna. Catholicism was the only permitted religion and the *Letter of Majesty* was formally abolished.²⁶

6. CONTAINING THE WAR

A. England

Outside of Germany, Frederick V found limited support. Only Denmark, Sweden, Venice and the Dutch Republic recognised his election as King of Bohemia. Others were much more cautious, not wanting the war to spread. With regard to England, Frederick's wife Elizabeth wrote to her father, King James I, pleading, 'I most humbly entreat your Majesty to take care of the King [Frederick] and myself by sending us help. Otherwise we shall be entirely ruined.'²⁷ James refused the pleas from his daughter and son-in-law, only going so far as to provide a loan to Elizabeth and Frederick, and turn a blind eye as 2,000 English volunteers made their way to Bohemia to fight for the Protestant cause.

Although the people of England and their Parliament were very concerned with the interests of the Protestants in Germany, James I refused to allow his realm to become more deeply involved in the conflict for two reasons. First, he was concerned with questions of dynasty, regarding which he asked his son-in-law, 'can you show me a good ground for the Palatine's invasion of the property of another?' ... So you are of

²⁴ See page 80.

²⁵ 'Letter of Elector John George of Saxony, 1623' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 63; Grant, R (2011) *1001 Battles* (London, Penguin) 318.

²⁶ Curtis, B (2013). *The Habsburgs* (London, Bloomsbury) 134; Greengrass, M (2015) *Christendom Destroyed: Europe 1517–1648* (NYC, Penguin) 590–93.

²⁷ Elizabeth, as noted in Royle, T (2005) *Civil War: The Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (London, Abacus) 15.

the opinion that subjects can dispossess their kings?²⁸ Secondly, James, who saw himself as an international peacemaker, thought that peace could more easily be achieved in Europe through diplomacy than war. James preferred to pursue a rapprochement with Spain with his proposed ‘Spanish Match’ (that is, a royal marriage between his son Charles and the Spanish, Catholic Habsburgs). He hoped this match would give him leverage over the King of Spain. When Parliament (representing the majority of the English, many of whom had clear memories of Elizabeth I and her strong sense of England’s Protestant mission) expressed its concern at this warming of relations with Spain, the king warned them not to interfere in matters of what he saw as the royal prerogative, threatening Members of Parliament with imprisonment. Parliament responded with the Protestation of 1621, in which the members denied, by implication, the king’s claim to have the right to imprison members at his will, asserting that their rights were ancient privileges. They added that they were very much within their rights to discuss foreign relations, the defence of the realm and religious matters. James responded by dissolving Parliament, imprisoning some members and placing others under house arrest.

When the negotiations for the Spanish Match failed to bear fruit (after the Spanish refused to entertain any idea that James’s son-in-law, Frederick V, would have his rights or territories in the Palatinate restored to him, and insisted that Prince Charles later King Charles I would have to convert to Catholicism and live in Spain for a year), James changed tack. At this point, it was decided that Prince Charles would instead marry the Catholic Princess Henrietta Maria, the youngest daughter of King Henri IV of France and sister to the future French King, Louis XIII. Accompanying this shift from a pro-Spain to a pro-France policy, James summoned Parliament and restored the topic of foreign relations as being within its prerogative. Subsequently, the likelihood of war with the Catholic Habsburgs became very real, as Parliament voted to give the king an unprecedented amount of money:

[f]or the maintenance of that war that may hereupon ensue, and more particularly for the defence of this realm of England, the securing of your kingdom of Ireland, the assistance of your neighbours the states of the United Provinces ... [W]e have resolved to give ... the greatest aid which ever was granted in Parliament.²⁹

B. France

In the decade following the assassination of Henri IV of France in 1610, there was little likelihood that the French would go to war against the Habsburgs. The foreign

²⁸ James I, as noted in Davies, G (1985) *The Early Stuarts* (Oxford, Clarendon Press) 56.

²⁹ The ‘Subsidy of 1624’ in Cohen, M (ed) (2004) *History in Quotations* (London, Cassell) 420; also Pursell, B (2002) ‘The End of the Spanish Match’, *The Historical Journal* 45 (4), 699–726; Pursell, B (2000) ‘James I and the Dissolution of the Parliament of 1621’, *History* 85 (279), 428–45; Davies, G (1987) *The Early Stuarts* (Oxford, Oxford University Press) 3–4, 27, 49.

policy of Henri IV had been reversed by the regent and advisers of the young King Louis XIII. Louis, who was crowned when he was nine years old, was married in 1615 to Anne, the daughter of Philip III of Spain and his wife Margaret of Austria (and sister of Philip IV). At the same time, Elizabeth, the oldest daughter of Henri IV (and sister of Louis XIII), became the first wife of Philip IV of Spain. These marriages were designed to cement military and political alliances between Spain and France, and to promote cooperation, not conflict, between the two superpowers.³⁰

The initial years of Louis XIII's reign were tense within France. The last meeting of the Estates General to be held before the French Revolution in 1789 took place before the 12-year old King of France in 1614. His father, Henri IV, had carefully controlled the Estates General as part of the process of building a united France. Upon the death of Henri, rebellions started to break out within the realm, as a result of which the regency government of Marie de' Medici agreed to the calling of the Estates General, as a way to keep the peace. However, at the gathering, when the first article of debate proposed that royal authority was above all other human authority in France, the First Estate (the clerics) vigorously objected, due to their belief in the primacy of the Pope. The Second (nobles) and Third (the representatives of the remainder of the population) Estates then entered into acrimonious argument over whether the Third Estate could call the Second Estate 'brothers' or not. When it was clear that agreement was not possible, the meeting was dissolved. The following year, when the *Parlement* of Paris decided to try to assemble on its own initiative, it was decreed that anyone who tried to assemble without authority would be guilty of lese-majesty.³¹

In terms of conflict based around religious differences, Louis XIII initially faced great difficulties, as rebellion broke out following his promotion of Catholicism in a number of Protestant areas. Louis' forces went on to defeat the Huguenot uprising, after which, although the *Edict of Nantes* was upheld, most of the fortified Huguenot areas (except La Rochelle and Montauban) were reduced as a consequence of the 1622 *Treaty of Montpellier*. Although Louis was not going to persecute his Huguenot subjects for their religion, due to fears centred on what he had seen happen with the United Provinces, he was not going to tolerate separatism in France, as this was incompatible with royal power. When the Huguenots in La Rochelle rebelled again, Louis entered into an agreement with the British for military assistance, although English ships would not attack La Rochelle, which contained 'innocent Protestants ... on behalf of a popish king'.³²

³⁰ Seward, D (2013) *The Bourbon Kings of France* (London, Jones) 32–33; Cooper, J (ed) (1970) *The New Cambridge Modern History: The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years' War*, Vol VI (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) 313–15, 481, 518–25.

³¹ Sager, J (2012) 'The Development of Royal Authority in Early Bourbon France', *The Catholic Historical Review* 98 (3), 456–75; Nelson, E (2000) 'Defining the Fundamental Laws of France: The Proposed First Article of the French Estates General of 1614', *The English Historical Review* 115 (464), 1216–30; Rothroc, G (1960) 'The French Crown and the Estates General of 1614', *French Historical Studies* 1 (3), 295–318.

³² Davies, G (1985) *The Early Stuarts* (Oxford, Clarendon Press) 64.

The English failure to help led to the French king's turning to the Dutch for assistance. This was agreed in the Franco-Dutch *Treaty of Compiègne* of 1624. With this, in the wake of the *Twelve Years' Truce*,³³ France agreed to subsidise the Dutch war effort against Spain as part of their general efforts to undermine the Habsburgs, and in exchange the Dutch provided ships to be used by the French against the Huguenots rebelling at La Rochelle. In addition, Dutch actions regarding French enterprises in the New World were to be more cooperative, and not competitive or hostile.³⁴

With Dutch assistance, Louis was finally able to defeat the Huguenots, despite the latter's assistance from England, concerning which King Charles I had authorised some 8,000 men (of which only 3,000 ever returned) to participate in their defence. In so doing, Charles ended up fighting against his brother-in-law, Louis XIII, after the relationship between the French and English thrones became tense over the treatment of Henrietta Maria and the expulsion of most of her Catholic household. Charles I's military help came to nothing and the Huguenot surrender was unconditional. In the *Peace of Alais* that followed, the Huguenots lost all of their territorial, political and military rights, and their existence as an independent Protestant state within France ceased. Although they were allowed to retain their religious freedom, granted by the *Edict of Nantes*, they were now at the mercy of the monarchy—a king with absolute authority who could govern without restraint over a fully united land. As Cardinal Richelieu, the Chief Minister to Louis XIII, suggested:

The roots of heresy, rebellion, disorder and civil war, which have exhausted France for so long, are dried up ... It is certain that the end of La Rochelle is the end of the miseries of France and the beginnings of her happiness.³⁵

7. THE EXPANDING WAR: DENMARK

Despite the reluctance of his father, James I, to get drawn into the war in Europe, the new King of England, Charles I, who came to the throne in 1625, saw things differently. He feared what an all-powerful Habsburg dynasty could achieve. His first step to confront this threat was taken in September 1625, when he agreed the *Treaty of Southampton* between the United Netherlands and Britain, 'for the purpose of attacking the King of Spain in open war in all his realms ... in all places, on this side and beyond the line, by land and sea'.³⁶ This alliance was to last as long as the King of Spain attacked

³³ See page 134.

³⁴ 'The 1624 Treaty of Compiègne' in Davenport, F (ed) (1917) *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648* (NYC, Carnegie Institute) 285–90.

³⁵ Cardinal Richelieu, as reproduced in Cohen, M (ed) (2004) *History in Quotations* (London, Cassell) 412; Cooper, J (ed) (1970) *The New Cambridge Modern History. The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years' War*, Vol VI (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) 322, 487–88.

³⁶ 'The 1625 Treaty of Southampton Between the United Netherlands and Britain' in Davenport, F (ed) (1917) *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648* (NYC, Carnegie Institute) 290.

the Netherlands, or occupied the estates of Frederick's Palatinate. Like the *Treaty of Compiègne* before it, the *Treaty of Southampton* also tried to calm the increasingly tense rivalry between the Dutch, English and French colonies on the east coast of North America. The second step was taken in December 1625, when the *Treaty of The Hague* was agreed. Although this treaty was limited by the fact that France was not a signatory (as France was currently angry about the English support for the Huguenots and was working on a building a peaceful relationship with Spain through the 1626 *Treaty of Monzon*), the English, Dutch and Transylvanians, and even the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire (the last by proxy), agreed to come together against a common enemy.³⁷

What this meant in practice was that the Dutch and the English paid King Christian IV of Denmark-Norway, who was the dominant power in northern Europe, having recently defeated the forces of his main rival, Gustavus Adolphus, the King of Sweden, to fight in Germany. Specifically, the Dutch and the English (although the English Parliament later blocked the commitments of Charles I to help his uncle, the Danish king) promised Christian IV the sum of 144,000 *thalers* per month, to invade and retake the Rhineland Palatinate and Bohemia for Frederick V. This suited Christian IV, as his son had been elected to certain positions of power in some of the secularised bishoprics, as a result of which Christian IV sought to bring these territories under the permanent hereditary control of his family. Although the Danish aristocracy was not keen on the war, the Protestant clergy supported it, arguing that the conflict was the manifestation of divine wrath brought upon the people of Denmark for their collective sins, and only by killing the enemy could they be saved from their own iniquity. Christian IV avoided such colourful language, preferring to focus on the conflict as a political or confessional necessity. Thus:

In order to save [Bohemia] which, though completely innocent, had been attacked contrary to the imperial constitution and the sworn capitulations, and to save German liberty, we joined with [the Dutch and the English] in a confederation so that, with the grace of God, liberty and the Religious and Secular Peace [of 1555] might not be lost ... [W]e will not rest until it comes to pass that the princes and estates of the Roman Empire—of both one and the other religion—shall all live together in binding peace.³⁸

Christian IV then crossed the River Elbe and marched south with 20,000 mercenaries. Johann Tserclaes, the Count of Tilly, with 30,000 men of the Catholic League at his disposal, first stopped Christian IV in 1626 at Dessau, and then completely destroyed the Danish forces at Lutter. This victory was monumental for the Catholics and, following further small mopping-up operations, the wider Protestant alliance fragmented. Rather than being pursued further, Denmark agreed to the *Treaty of Lubeck* with the

³⁷ Davies, G (1985) *The Early Stuarts* (Oxford, Clarendon Press) 52–53; Childs, J (2001) *Warfare in the Seventeenth Century* (London, Cassel) 39.

³⁸ 'Letter of King Christian IV of Denmark, 1626' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 77; also Lockhart, P (2001) 'Political Language and Wartime Propaganda in Denmark, 1625–1629', *European History Quarterly* 31 (1), 542; Beller, E (1928) 'The Military Expedition of Sir Charles Morgan to Germany, 1627–29', *The English Historical Review* 43 (172), 528–39.

Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II. This restored Christian IV to most of his pre-war possessions and allowed him not to be crippled with paying compensation for the war. In exchange, Christian IV was obliged to cede his claims to the Lower Saxon bishoprics and discontinue his alliances with the North German states. He also had to promise not to interfere in imperial affairs in the future. At the same time, King Philip IV of Spain offered the United Provinces peace, with large degrees of autonomy, but they had to guarantee the protection of the Catholic religion and recognise the Spanish king as their eternal protector.³⁹

By 1629, The Emperor Ferdinand II was feeling so confident in his military victories, and in his theological drive to 'placate God by obeying His laws and by making sure others obey them, without exception',⁴⁰ he decided to roll back 75 years of Protestant advances with his *Edict of Restitution*. The 1629 *Edict* was an attempt to enforce the 1555 *Peace of Augsburg* and its predecessor, the 1552 *Peace of Passau*, which had allowed Protestant princes to keep all ecclesiastical properties they had seized before 1552, but had stipulated that no further ecclesiastical properties should be reformed or secularised. The 1629 *Edict* sought to enforce the Ecclesiastical Reservation of 1555, which had stipulated that ecclesiastical rulers (such as prince-bishops) must give up their offices and rights should they change religions. Over time, many princes had failed to abide by this stipulation, meaning that large amounts of Catholic Church land had fallen into the hands of the Protestants. The *Edict of Restitution* demanded the return of this property. This demand changed the map of northern Germany, implicating five bishoprics, about 30 cities, nearly 100 convents and an incalculable number of parishes. In addition, the *Edict* sought to ensure that only those named in the 1555 Peace, namely Lutherans, were entitled to any tolerance. Thus:

We hereby ... declare and recognise that the Religious Peace concerns and includes only those of the ancient Catholic religion and the adherents of the unaltered Augsburg Confession ... All other contrary doctrines and sects, of whatever name and whether they have already arisen or are still to arise shall be impermissible, excluded from the peace, forbidden, and neither tolerated nor suffered.⁴¹

As Denmark reached for peace with Emperor Ferdinand II, England also bowed out of the arena. King Charles I, who was soon to be engulfed in his own civil war,⁴² agreed to peace with France (following his earlier failed intervention to help the Huguenots) with the 1629 *Treaty of Susa*, and then in 1632 with the *Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye*, through which France recovered the territories the English and Scottish had occupied in New France, including, inter alia, Quebec and Nova Scotia, which had been taken

³⁹ Friedrich, C (1952) *The Age of the Baroque* (NYC, Harper) 161, 174.

⁴⁰ Ferdinand II, as in Parker, G (2013) *Global Crisis: War, Climate and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press) 42.

⁴¹ 'The Edict of Restitution, 1629', as reproduced in Reddaway, F (ed) (1930) *Select Documents in European History*, Vol II (London, Methuen) 123.

⁴² See chapter VIII.

in their recent conflict.⁴³ Charles also made peace with Spain in the 1630 *Treaty of Madrid*, and withdrew from his alliance with the Dutch, in large part due to the ongoing difficulties caused by Dutch commercial activities at the expense of the English.⁴⁴

8. THE EXPANDING WAR: SWEDEN

As the English bowed out, the French re-entered the conflict. Despite initially reconciling over a few issues with Spain in the *Treaty of Moncon* of 1526, Louis XIII and his principal adviser, Cardinal Richelieu, realised that the biggest threat to the French monarchy was no longer wars caused by religious division, but rather encirclement by their fellow Catholics, the Habsburgs. Specifically, 'with regard to foreign policy, a constant scheme for putting a stop to the progress of Spain should be adopted ... whenever an opportunity should present itself.'⁴⁵ The significance of this recognition was monumental, as at this point the Thirty Years' War could no longer easily be disguised as a war about religion since both the Habsburgs and the Bourbons were Catholic. Now it was a war between dynasties. The plan that Louis XIII then created to oppose the Habsburgs was multi-layered. First, in 1631, peace was made with Savoy under the *Treaty of Cherasco*, which allowed France, inter alia, control of a pass over the Alps that guaranteed the French access to Italy. In the same year, the French agreed (but did not keep) the secret *Treaty of Fontainebleau*, whereby they promised they would not attack Catholic Bavaria. Secondly, and most significantly, they repeated the trick the Dutch and English had tried with the Danish, paying someone else to fight in Germany. The difference was that the French paid Gustavus Adolphus, the very Lutheran King of Sweden, to enter the war.

Gustavus Adolphus was already engaged in a conflict with the Catholic forces of Europe, in particular against Sigismund III Vasa, the King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania. The two rulers hated each other. Sigismund was firmly of the belief that Gustavus Adolphus was wrongfully in possession of the Crown of Sweden, which he believed belonged to him. Conversely, Gustavus Adolphus was of the view that Sigismund was wrongfully oppressing his non-Catholic subjects. War had broken out earlier, as Gustavus Adolphus, after concluding a peace with Russia in 1617 with the *Treaty of Stolbovo*,⁴⁶ decided to seize Livonia (which was part of Sigismund's territory).

⁴³ 'The 1629 Treaty of Susa Between Britain and France' in Davenport, F (ed) (1917) *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648* (NYC, Carnegie Institute) 300–04; the 1632 'Treaty of Saint Germaine', *ibid*, 315–32.

⁴⁴ 'The 1630 Treaty of Peace and Commerce Between Spain and Britain' in Davenport, F (ed) (1917) *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648* (NYC, Carnegie Institute) 305–14.

⁴⁵ See generally, Cardinal Richelieu, 'Advice to Louis XIII: Foreign Policy' in Reddaway, F (ed) (1930) *Select Documents in European History*, Vol II (London, Methuen) 117. See also Richelieu, 'Political Testament', as reproduced in Elton, G (ed) (1968) *Renaissance and Reformation* (London, Macmillan) 141–42.

⁴⁶ See page 197.

His military successes between 1621 and 1625 gave him and his 50,000 soldiers the confidence to go on and attack Sigismund in his heartland of western Prussia in 1626. His military successes over the following three years saw the whole coastline, except Danzig, under his control, with a Swedish drive into central Poland a real possibility. The six-year armistice agreed at Altmärk in the middle of 1629 suited both sides. The Swedes gained all of Livonia, except a few districts in the south-east. In western Prussia, they won possession of all of the ports, apart from Danzig and Puck, and in the Duchy of Prussia, almost the entire coastline, except for Königsberg. The Polish Diet ratified the armistice without blinking, not wanting to get drawn into the even larger conflict that was exploding around them. They were suspicious of the intentions of their king, Sigismund III Vasa. They were particularly angry at him for the high taxes he demanded to pay for his war, and for his refusing to compromise over the Swedish throne, after Gustavus Adolphus hinted that he was willing to surrender Livonia if Sigismund resigned his dynastic claim to Sweden.⁴⁷

As the Polish Diet was trying to keep Poland out of the conflict that was engulfing Europe, Gustavus Adolphus was trying to involve Sweden in it. The pathway to his entry was the *Treaty of Barwalde*, which he agreed with France. Under the terms of the treaty, there would be 'an alliance for the defence of the friends of both of them [France and Sweden] for the safeguarding of the Baltic and Oceanic Seas, the liberty of commerce and the restitution of the oppressed States of the [Holy] Roman Empire'.⁴⁸ France was required to give 400,000 *reichstalers* in exchange for Sweden's maintaining an army of 36,000 troops in Germany. Sweden also had to promise religious tolerance towards Catholics in any territories it captured. Gustavus Adolphus expressed himself as content to sign the treaty and involve Sweden in the conflict, since he saw the dangers that an overly strong Emperor posed to Sweden, wished to aid his fellow Protestants, and did not want the Habsburgs to control the Baltic and its trade. He proclaimed he was protecting 'German Liberties', seeking to rescue the imperial constitution and end the illegal suppression of Protestants. He added, 'I am seeking no profit for myself accept the safety of my realm ... I will not hear of neutrality ... God is fighting with the devil'.⁴⁹

Gustavus Adolphus' rhetoric was not successful in all areas. The Lutheran ruler of Saxony, John George, remained loyal to the Emperor, and George William of Brandenburg, even though he was the brother-in-law of Gustavus Adolphus, remained neutral. The 1631 *Leipzig Manifesto* recorded this neutrality, the Protestant estates attempting to create a Protestant defensive association to occupy the middle

⁴⁷ Frost, R (2000) *The Northern Wars 1558–1721* (London, Longman) 102–10, 115–20.

⁴⁸ The 'Treaty of Barwalde', as reproduced in Cohen, M (ed) (2004) *History in Quotations* (London, Cassell) 455.

⁴⁹ 'Gustavus Adolphus address to the Brandenburgers, 1630', as reproduced in Reddaway, F (ed) (1930) *Select Documents in European History*, Vol II (London, Methuen) 125; also 'Gustavus Adolphus Invasion of the Empire, 1630' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 98; Piirimäe, P (2002) 'Just War in Theory and Practice: The Legitimation of Swedish Intervention in the Thirty Years' War', *The Historical Journal* 45 (3), 499–523.

ground between Ferdinand II and Gustavus Adolphus, whereby they promised to uphold 'the basic laws, the Imperial constitution and the German liberties of the Protestant states'.⁵⁰ Where Gustavus Adolphus was successful was in the city of Magdeburg, which decided to ally itself with the King of Sweden. However, before Magdeburg could put its support into action, the city was besieged by imperial forces, with as many as 20,000 defenders and 25,000 civilians dying in the course of the siege. The ferocity of the action shocked Europe and inspired both Saxony and Brandenburg to change their views on neutrality. John George joined the Swedes when he felt the threat of the imperial troops surrounding Saxony was becoming too much to bear. The combined Swedish and Saxon army then met the imperial forces in battle at Breitenfeld near Leipzig soon afterwards. General Tilly's imperial army, which numbered over 24,000, was comprehensively defeated, with more than 7,000 soldiers killed by Swedish gunfire and a further 9,000 captured. Gustavus Adolphus then marched his armies west towards the Rhineland, with General Tilly being one of the further 2,000 dead, as the General's force of 22,000 men failed to stop the 37,000-strong army of Gustavus Adolphus from entering Bavaria. With Tilly dead, General Wallenstein took charge of the imperial troops. Ferdinand II enticed him with the promise of 'an Austrian hereditary territory as recompense for his regular expenses', as well as his being able to 'exercise the highest jurisdiction over the territories he occupies'.⁵¹ General Wallenstein attacked the Swedish forces in November 1632. Although the Swedes were victorious at the Battle of Lutzen, Gustavus Adolphus (along with an estimated 12,000 men dead on the battlefield, divided equally between the two sides) was killed. Nevertheless, his forces were now in occupation of about half of Germany.⁵²

As both sides took stock after the Battle of Lutzen, the *Heilbronn League* was formed. This 1633 agreement brought together France and Sweden with princes from the courts of Swabia, Franconia and the Lower Rhine. They agreed to pay for a new, united League army and to keep fighting until the Empire's constitutional and religious problems were resolved, and Sweden was compensated for its troubles.⁵³ In the meantime, the Emperor Ferdinand II, fearing that General Wallenstein was becoming too powerful (after Wallenstein, believing that the Emperor wanted to kill him, made his colonels swear an oath of allegiance to him), had him denounced as a traitor and assassinated.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ The 1631 'Leipzig Manifesto' in Parker, G (1998) *The Thirty Years' War* (London, Routledge) 106; also Bodo, N (1979) 'Brandenburg's Reformed Rite and the Leipzig Manifesto', *Journal of Religious History* 10 (4), 365–83.

⁵¹ The 'Contract Between Wallenstein and Ferdinand II' in Cohen, M (ed) (2004) *History in Quotations* (London, Cassell) 455.

⁵² Cooper, J (ed) (1970) *The New Cambridge Modern History. The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years' War*, Vol IV (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) 398–99, 470–72; Grant, R (2011) *1001 Battles* (London, Penguin) 328–29.

⁵³ 'Memorandum of Hoe von Hoeneegg' in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years' War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 137.

⁵⁴ Greengrass, M (2015) *Christendom Destroyed: Europe 1517–1648* (NYC, Penguin) 614–15.

Ferdinand II and his armies then vanquished the Swedish-German Protestant force in 1634 at the Battle of Nördlingen, the Protestants losing some 8,000 men on the battlefield, with a further 4,000 being captured. The imperial and Spanish armies, who had lost only 1,500 men out of a combined force of over 30,000, advanced easily through Franconia, Swabia and Württemberg. The entire populations of towns fled as the armies advanced and the Swedish forces withdrew from central Germany to the coast. Realising that they could not afford to fight on two fronts—against the Emperor and against Sigismund III Vasa—in 1635 the Swedes agreed the *Treaty of Stuhmsdorf* with Poland-Lithuania. This provided for a 26-year armistice between the two sides. In exchange, although Sweden kept Livonia, Poland regained what she had lost in Prussia, and the Swedes had to give up all their ‘licences’ in Prussian ports. Although nothing was said on the long-standing dynastic questions between the two realms, this treaty kept Sweden in the war, and kept one potential enemy, Poland-Lithuania, out of it.⁵⁵

As the Heilbronn League dissolved, the Protestant Elector of Saxony, soon to be followed by other German estates and princes, made peace with Ferdinand II in the *Peace of Prague* in May 1635. This treaty sought to put an end to the ‘wretchedness, want and destruction’ caused by the dissension between warring parties and by the armies of foreign peoples ‘on the soil of the beloved fatherland of the noble German nation’.⁵⁶ The political essence of this Peace was that Ferdinand II was willing to compromise, relinquishing some of the militancy that had accompanied his earlier positions. The technical essence of this peace was that the *Edict of Restitution* that Ferdinand wanted to enforce would not be applied for 40 years, and the date from which the *Edict of Restitution* would be applied would not be 1555 but rather 1627. Thus, any ecclesiastical lands seized before 1627 would not have to be repatriated. The people of Saxony were also granted an amnesty. In exchange, they had to cede their right to independent military forces and direction, and support the Emperor in his wars against any foreign forces, especially the Swedish.⁵⁷

9. THE EXPANDING WAR: FRANCE

The last stage of the Thirty Years’ War saw the French getting directly involved in the fighting. Louis XIII was becoming increasingly concerned about the war-weariness of the Dutch and the retreats by Swedish forces in Germany. When Spain arrested

⁵⁵ Cooper, J (ed) (1970) *The New Cambridge Modern History. The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years’ War*, Vol IV (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) 398, 600.

⁵⁶ As noted in Mowat, R (1888) *A History of European Diplomacy: 1451–1769* (London, Butler) 102–05.

⁵⁷ ‘The Peace of Prague, 1635’ in Helfferich, T (2009) *The Thirty Years’ War: A Documentary History* (Cambridge, Hackett) 170; Bireley, R (1976) ‘The Peace of Prague and the Counter-Reformation in Germany’, *The Journal of Modern History* 48 (1), 31–70; Moutoux, E (1982) ‘Wallenstein: Guilty and Innocent’, *The Germanic Review* 57 (1), 23–40.

the Bishop of Triers, who was under French protection, Louis XIII had the excuse he needed to declare war on Spain, mobilising 150,000 men in 1635. To bolster the anti-Habsburg effort, the French renewed their alliances with the Dutch and then increased their subsidies to the Swedes (first under the *Treaty of Wismar* of 1636 and later under the *Treaty of Hamburg* of 1641), promising 1,000,000 *livres*, about one-third of Sweden's domestic income, if the Swedes remained engaged in the fight and followed French direction, continuing to fight in Silesia and Bohemia.⁵⁸

The Habsburgs retaliated swiftly. In the middle of 1636, imperial troops invaded Burgundy, while a Spanish army attacked Picardy. It advanced across the Somme, only to find its advance blocked by some 40,000 French troops commanded by Louis XIII, standing between the Spanish and Paris. Thereafter, the tide turned. Victory after victory followed for the French and Dutch, with them retaking Breda in 1637. In 1638, an imperial army was destroyed at Rheinfelden, thus allowing most of Alsace to be conquered. In the same year, the fortress town of Breisach was lost, which cut the vital 'Spanish Road' linking Habsburg possessions from Milan to Brussels, thus meaning that reinforcements now had to come by sea. When this was next attempted, at the Battle of the Downs in the English Channel in 1639, the Spanish lost 54 ships (with more than 7,000 dead and 1,800 captured), while the Dutch lost only one vessel. To make matters even worse for King Philip IV of Spain, in 1640 there was an uprising in Catalonia, in which a disgruntled peasantry, angry over persistent demands for men and money to support Philip's wars, turned on the aristocracy. When the President of Catalonia pledged allegiance to the French king, Louis XIII, Philip IV ended up having to find another army to defeat the rebels. His first major battle in this conflict, at Montjuic, was a disaster, with over 1,500 of Philip's men killed as the rebels established control over Barcelona.⁵⁹

Although the revolt in Catalonia was eventually brought under control, a coup in Portugal (in part due to the costs of Philip's wars and foreigners making decisions for the Portuguese) in 1640 saw the Duke of Braganza named as the new King John IV of Portugal. Although Philip IV would repeatedly try to reclaim Portugal by force, the determination of the Portuguese, supplemented by money and support from England, the Seven Provinces and France, made it impossible for Philip IV to reclaim this part of the Habsburg Empire.⁶⁰

As both branches of the Habsburgs began to search for peace, the advances of the Dutch, Swedes and French continued. By 1641, the French and the Swedes had

⁵⁸ Lesaffer, R (2006) 'Defensive Warfare, Prevention and Hegemony: The Justifications for the Franco-Spanish War of 1635', *Journal of the History of International Law* 8, 91–123, 141–79; Parker, G (2013) *Global Crisis: War, Climate and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, CT, Yale University Press) 32.

⁵⁹ Grant, R (2011) *1001 Battles* (London, Penguin) 320, 334, 335, 336, 337, 340, 341, 344.

⁶⁰ 'The 1641 Treaty of Alliance Between Portugal and France' and the '1641 Treaty of Truce and Commerce Between the United Netherlands and Portugal' in Davenport, F (ed) (1917) *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648* (NYC, Carnegie Institute) 324–46; Curtis, B (2013) *The Habsburgs* (London, Bloomsbury) 125–29; Seward, D (2013) *The Bourbon Kings of France* (London, Jones) 60–63.

actually joined forces. At the second Battle of Breitenfeld in 1642, the Swedes defeated the imperial army (which suffered losses of 5,000 dead and 5,000 captured), allowing them to occupy Saxony. The Habsburg hope was that when Denmark was persuaded to attack a distracted Sweden in 1643, some relief could be found. However, the Danish forces were quickly pushed back and subsequently punished with the *Peace of Bromesbro* in 1645, in which the Swedes acquired a number of Danish provinces and islands, and the Danish heir to the throne had to resign.

Once the Danes were in hand, the collective push into the Habsburg areas continued. At Rocroi, on the border of the Spanish Netherlands, in May 1643, despite their own loss of 2,000 men, the French killed 6,000 Spanish veterans in one evening (and captured a further 5,000) as they tried to withstand a French artillery bombardment. The following year, in 1644, following a Swedish alliance with the Transylvanian Prince, Gyorgy Rakoczi I, Habsburg Hungary was invaded. At Freiburg in 1644, although the French suffered heavier casualties (7,000 out of 25,000), they again defeated the imperial forces (2,500 out of 16,500), forcing them to retreat, allowing the French to gain mastery over the central Rhine region. Despite the fact that the French were defeated at Tuttlingen in 1644, the Spanish Netherlands lost Gravelines, Hulst in 1645 and Dunkirk in 1646. By the time of the Battle of Jankov in Bohemia, in 1645, the imperial cause was desperate. The Swedish victory not only left 4,000 imperial troops dead on the field, with another 4,500 captured (at a cost of 2,000 dead to the Swedes), it also opened the way for threatening Habsburg Vienna. Realising that they had to reduce the number of enemies against them, in the same year, 1645, the Emperor Ferdinand III broke the Transylvanian Prince, Gyorgy Rakoczi off from the French-Swedish alliance with the *Treaty of Linz*. In exchange for the ending of their alliance, the seven provinces Gyorgy had control over were granted religious freedom, Protestants who had fled were allowed to return and land that had been confiscated by the Catholics was restored. However, this remained insufficient for the Habsburg's to regain their military composure. A comprehensive peace was essential for both parts of the Habsburg Empire if they were going to survive as a dynasty. If there was any doubt over this possibility, at Zusmarshausen, in May 1648, the retreating imperial army narrowly avoided being completely annihilated (but still losing 2,200 men) by a French-Swedish army that continued to pursue it.⁶¹

10. THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA

The so-called 'Peace of Westphalia', which brought an end to the Thirty Years' War, was made up of three separate treaties, negotiated between January and October 1648. Delegations from all of Europe, bar England, Poland, Russia and Turkey, were

⁶¹ Mowat, R (1910) 'The Mission of Sir Thomas Roe to Vienna, 1641', *The English Historical Review* 25 (98), 264–75.

present at the negotiations. Peace was brought to most (but not all) of the Continent with, first, the *Peace of Munster*, signed in January 1648, between the Dutch Republic and the Kingdom of Spain. Two complementary treaties signed in October 1648 were the *Treaty of Munster*, between the Holy Roman Emperor and France and their respective allies; and the *Treaty of Osnabruck*, involving the Holy Roman Empire, Sweden and their respective allies.

The *Peace of Munster* of 1648 was made against the will of the national leader of the Seven Provinces, the stadtholder, William II, Prince of Orange, and a number of Calvinists, who wanted to keep fighting the Catholics and recover the southern provinces to establish a truly united Netherlands. The majority, however, wanted to establish peace so that the Netherlands could trade, make money, pay war debts and become recognised as a sovereign country. Accordingly, the States General agreed, by a thin majority, to ratify the *Peace of Munster*, to which Philip IV of Spain agreed to put his signature. Article 1 of the *Peace of Munster* stated:

The Lord King [Philip IV] recognises that the United Netherlands and the respected provinces thereof ... are free and sovereign states, and he ... does not now make any claim, ... his successors and descendants will in the future never make any claim ... and is therefore satisfied to negotiate a perpetual peace, on the conditions hereinafter.⁶²

In addition to the standard promises to engage in normal commerce, cooperate against pirates, not build new forts, offer amnesty for crimes committed and the exchange of prisoners, the Seven Provinces kept those parts of Flanders, Brabant and Limburg they had conquered following the 1608 Truce.⁶³ Spanish efforts to obtain religious liberty for these homogeneously Roman Catholic areas failed. These became, in effect, conquered territories. No special protection was given to the citizens on grounds of religion, although it was added that when the subjects of either signatory were in the lands of the other, they should 'conduct themselves in the matter of public exercise of religion with all piety, giving no scandal by word or deed and speaking no slander'.⁶⁴

The *Treaty of Munster* of 1648 brought a 'universal, perpetual, Christian peace' between the Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand III and France (and their allies).⁶⁵ Aside from the standard promises regarding amnesty and the exchange of prisoners, although Louis XIV, through his regent, his mother Queen Anne, and chief minister Cardinal Mazarin, had to restore much of what his father's troops had conquered, the Bishoprics of Metz, Toul and Verdun were all ceded to France. Part of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine were also to go to France, but the terms of cession were extremely vague. The *Treaty of Munster* also recorded that the princes had 'territorial

⁶² Art 1 of the 'Peace of Munster' in Rowen, H (ed) (1972) *The Low Countries in Early Modern Times: Select Documents* (London, Macmillan) 181; also Manzano, B (2007) 'Negotiating Sovereignty: The Peace Treaty of Munster, 1648', *History of Political Thought* 28 (4), 617–41.

⁶³ See page 134.

⁶⁴ See Article 19.

⁶⁵ The 'Treaty of Munster' in Reddaway, F (ed) (1930) *Select Documents in European History*, Vol II (London, Methuen) 134.

superiority in all matters ecclesiastical as well as political'. They thus had the right to conclude treaties between themselves and with other sovereign powers. The 'old liberties' of the prince were thus transformed into sovereignty, even though this word was not used.⁶⁶

The final agreement in the trilogy, the *Treaty of Osnabruck*, established 'a Christian, universal, perpetual, true and sincere peace and friendship' between Ferdinand III and Sweden (and their allies).⁶⁷ In addition to the standard rules on amnesty for crimes committed and a return of prisoners, Sweden negotiated handsome rewards, which also made it a power in the affairs of Germany. These included the cession of Pomerania, Rugen, Stettin, the mouth of the great northern river, Oder Wismar, the Archbishopric of Bremen and Verden. In addition, 600,000 gold crowns and 5 million *rixdollars* were agreed as the amount needed to get Swedish mercenaries demobbed and out of German territories. Calvinism was recognised as being equal to the Catholic and Lutheran faiths, and the *Convention of Passau* of 1552 and the *Peace of Augsburg* of 1555 were again underlined. The year 1624 was set as the date for the coming into force of the *Edict of Restitution*, not the original 1555.⁶⁸

Although religious toleration only extended to three Christian groupings, and its limits were still apparent, it was nonetheless agreed that 'subjects whose religion differs from that of their prince are to have equal rights with his other subjects.'⁶⁹ The independence of the Swiss was acknowledged, and the Rhine Palatinate was split into two parts. The Upper Palatinate and the district of Cham were handed over to Bavaria, whilst an eighth electorate was created and given to the deprived Elector Palatinate and his heirs. The Lower Palatinate was restored to the Elector Palatinate. Article VIII of the Treaty recognised the sovereignty of the members of the Holy Roman Empire, and provided for their free assembly to conduct all imperial affairs, to make laws, to make war or peace or alliances, and to raise taxes and/or soldiers. Lastly, both France and Sweden succeeded in inserting a clause into the peace treaties, providing that the election of the King of the Romans would not be permissible during the Emperor's lifetime, except in case of necessity. This was an attempt to stop the practice of monopolising the Imperial Crown, the Emperor's overseeing the election of his eldest son during the father's lifetime, thus keeping power in the family.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ See Arts 62, 63, 69–70 and 85; also Croxton, D (1999) 'The Peace of Westphalia of 1648 and the Origins of Sovereignty', *The International History Review* 21 (3), 569–83; Cooper, J (ed) (1970) *The New Cambridge Modern History. The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Year War* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press) 354–55.

⁶⁷ As reproduced in Reddaway, F (ed) (1930) *Select Documents in European History*, Vol II (London, Methuen) 132.

⁶⁸ See pages 80–81.

⁶⁹ See Art V(34); also Asch, R (2000) 'Religious Toleration, the Peace of Westphalia and the German Territorial Estates', *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 20 (1), 79–89.

⁷⁰ See Arts X and XVI; also Straumann, B (2008) 'The Peace of Westphalia as a Secular Constitution', *Constellations* 15 (1) 98–134.

11. RETHINKING WAR: CRUCÉ, SULLY AND GROTIUS

Out of all the carnage of the Thirty Years' War three scholars emerged who planted ideas that took root and went on to have impacts that would resonate throughout the centuries ahead.

The first was the French writer, Émeric Crucé, who in 1623 wrote the masterpiece, *The New Cyneas: Or Discourse on the Occasions and Means for Establishing General Peace and Free Trade Throughout the World*. His core proposition was, simply, that humanity would better spend its time pursuing commerce and communication rather than conflict. He recognised the importance of free trade, free travel and a universal currency. On the question of religion, he stressed tolerance not only between the different Christian faiths, but also of non-Christians such as the Muslims and Jews. He reasoned that since the ultimate answers about religion were unknowable, it was pointless to fight over differences in ceremonies. Waging war and killing others simply on the basis of their being different in terms of religion or nationality was the antithesis of humanity. As Crucé explained:

Why should I, a Frenchman, wish to harm an Englishman, a Spaniard, or a Hindu? I cannot when I consider that they are men like me, that I am subject like them to error and sin and that all nations are bound together by a natural and consequently indestructible tie, which ensures that a man cannot consider another to be a stranger.⁷¹

Crucé also suggested the founding of an international assembly in Venice, as it was neutral and well situated between all of the different nations. He recommended inviting the territories of the Pope, the Ottomans, the Habsburgs, as well as the Kings of Spain, Moscow, Poland, England and Denmark, as well as the republics of Venice and Switzerland. Persia, China, Japan, Ethiopia and the lands of the New World should also be included. The system he proposed involved committees, rotating chairpersons, and binding decisions based upon majority votes after hearing the cases put forward by opposing countries, as a result of which a country could be expelled from the assembly. Rules of conduct would involve recognition of the territorial status quo and non-intervention in the internal matters of member countries. Quite simply, Crucé envisaged an idealised League of Nations (then United Nations) 400 years before its foundation.⁷²

The second of these scholars was the adviser to the French king, Henri IV, Maximilien de Béthune, the first Duke of Sully, who published his *Grand Dessein de Henri IV* in 1638. This aimed to defuse the religious problems in Europe. Sully's foundation was religious tolerance in Europe between Lutherans, Catholics and Calvinists. This would be followed by the principle of equilibrium, under which all nations in Europe needed to be, more or less, the same size and with similar wealth. The Habsburg Empire

⁷¹ Crucé, E (1623) *The New Cyneas* (reprinted (1972) New York, Garland Publishing) 35; also Villaverde, M (2016) 'The Long Road to Religions Toleration: Emeric Crucé, Predecessor of the Enlightenment', *History of European Ideas* 1–14.

⁷² Heerikhuizen, A (2008) 'How God Disappeared from Europe: Visions of a United Europe from Erasmus to Kant', *The European Legacy* 13 (4), 401, 404–05.

was obviously too large and too dominant, and therefore gave rise to a lack of balance and was the cause of revolutions and conflict. What Sully proposed was a type of European confederation (of 66 representatives) representing (as they were as Sully saw them) the six hereditary monarchs, together with six elective powers and three federated republics.⁷³ Together the members of the confederation would come together to decide on matters collectively, through a permanent forum. He argued that a general council could levy troops and direct military operations against groups such as Orthodox Russia, or the Muslim Ottomans, and then preside over the division of the spoils. This approach was clearly more limited than what Crucé proposed, looking only to maintaining peace within Europe and establishing similarly sized countries. It did not encompass ideas of free trade, the status quo as regards territory or a much wider, more cosmopolitan view of the world.⁷⁴

The third great thinker of this epoch was Hugo Grotius. Grotius also sought answers to end conflict, based on reason and practice (not theology), that were ahead of his time. He recognised the wrongfulness of fighting over things that should be owned by all, not monopolised by any one nation, of which the high seas were most obvious. This argument was presented in his first famous book, *Mare Liberum* ('The Free Sea'), which linked freedom of trade to freedom of the seas, open to all nations to utilise freely. This argument was the antithesis of the idea that the Pope could divide up the Earth and award either land or seas to favoured sovereigns.⁷⁵ Grotius also argued that war based on plunder was not justifiable. He added, 'neither can the desire of emigrating to a more favourable soil and climate justify an attack on a neighbouring power.'⁷⁶ Moreover, it was unjust to base war on the 'discovery of things belonging to others'. Of the latter, and clearly with the conquests of Spain in the New World in mind, Grotius wrote:

Neither can wickedness, and impiety, nor any other incapacity of the original owner justify such a claim. Neither moral nor religious virtue, not any intellectual excellence is requisite to form a good title to property. Title and right by discovery can apply only to countries and places that have no owner ... [T]here is equal injustice in the desire of reducing, by force of arms, any people to a state of servitude, under the pretext of it being the condition for which they are best qualified by nature. It does not follow that, because any one is fitted for a particular condition, another has a right to impose it upon him. For every reasonable creature ought to be left free in the choice of what may be deemed useful or prejudicial to him.⁷⁷

⁷³ Hereditary monarchies: France, Spain, Britain, Denmark, Sweden and Lombardy; elective powers: the Papacy, Venice, the Holy Roman Empire, Poland, Hungary and Bohemia; federated republics: those in Italy, Belgium and what became the Netherlands.

⁷⁴ Heerikhuizen, A (2008), 'How God Disappeared from Europe: Visions of a United Europe from Erasmus to Kant', *The European Legacy* 13 (4), 401, 405–06.

⁷⁵ Thomson, E (2009) 'The Dutch Miracle, Modified: Hugo Grotius's *Mare Liberum*, Commercial Governance and Imperial War', *Grotiana* 30, 107–30; Ittersum, J (2012) 'Hugo Grotius' Justification of Dutch Expansion Overseas', *History of European Ideas* 36 (4), 386–411.

⁷⁶ Grotius, H (1625) *The Rights of War and Peace* (reprinted (1901) London, Dunne) 269; *ibid.*, at 77–84. Also Rupp, M (1924) 'Hugo Grotius and His Place in the History of International Peace', *The Catholic Historical Review* 19 (3), 358–66.

⁷⁷ Grotius, H (1625) *The Rights of War and Peace* (reprinted (1901) London, Dunne) 269–70.

Despite these reservations, in his most famous work, *De jure belli ac pacis libri tres* ('On the Law of War and Peace'), Grotius argued that killing and warfare could be lawful and just, although the methods by which war could be waged should always be limited. If peaceful arbitration could not resolve matters, war could be waged (for self-defence, recovery of property or debt, or the punishment of offences committed) if there was a formal decision to do so, originating from the correct sovereign authority. For Grotius, that authority was not restricted to monarchs, suggesting that sovereignty that could authorise war could also be held through 'government by nobles'.⁷⁸

Grotius also went on to write about and advocate religious tolerance, for which he was imprisoned. This occurred because he fell foul of the increasingly intolerant Dutch in the Seven Provinces (not those in America, who went on to become exemplarily tolerant), after becoming engaged in debates between Calvinists of a dogmatic persuasion and groups espousing a more Erasmian tolerance. Despite being imprisoned by his own government, he warned about entering into foreign conflicts to protect individuals who were being abused by other governments. This was especially so if the risk to the protecting country was great. Thus, 'under some circumstances it is impossible successfully to oppose cruelty and oppression, the punishment of which must be left to the eternal judge of mankind'.⁷⁹

12. CONCLUSION

The Thirty Years' War was the culmination of the violence, wrapped around considerations of religion and autonomy, which had spilled over from the sixteenth century. The irony of this situation was that by the seventeenth century, the driving force behind much of the religious dissent, the papacy, was itself a spent force. However, both kings and emperors decided to advance the Counter-Reformation and undo much of the peace which worked in Germany, by adopting interpretations that were both very strict, and missing the spirit of what the earlier peace agreements were about. These approaches became problematic in Bohemia, where promises which were made became the epicentre of the ensuing dispute, that the Protestants could retain their traditional rights and religious autonomy. It was when these traditional rights and autonomy were threatened by the Emperor Ferdinand II that the Bohemians attempted to

⁷⁸ Grotius, H (1625) *The Rights of War and Peace* (reprinted (1901) London, Dunne) 65, 314–15, 321; also, Pena, E (2014) 'Hugo Grotius: War Through Law', *Araucaria* 16 (32), 69–92; Lee, D (2011) 'Popular Liberty, Princely Government and the Roman Law in Hugo Grotius', *Journal in the History of Ideas* 72 (3), 371–92; Blois, M (2011) 'Grotius on Just War and Christian Pacifism', *Grotiana* 32, 20–39; Dunthorne, H (2013) 'History, Theology and Tolerance: Grotius and his Contemporaries', *Grotiana* 34, 107–19; Bangs, J (2010) 'Dutch Contributions to Religious Tolerance', *Church History* 79 (3), 585–613; Parker, C (2015) 'Hugo Grotius's Vision of Global Citizenship and Christian Unity', *Journal of Policy History* 27 (2), 364–81; Bull, H (1991) *Hugo Grotius and International Relations* (Oxford, Clarendon) 242–46; Forde, S (1998) 'Hugo Grotius on Ethics and War' *The American Political Science Review* 92 (3), 639–48.

⁷⁹ Grotius, H (1625) *The Rights of War and Peace* (reprinted (1901) London, Dunne) 288.

break free from the Holy Roman Empire, electing their own king, the Protestant leader, Frederick V. Although religion provided the initial gloss for the conflict, the Emperor and his allies justified it as being about illegal electoral processes, which threatened the integrity of the entire political apparatus.

Initially, both France and England tried to stay out of the war. However, as the power and success of the Habsburgs grew, Catholic France decided to throw her weight behind the Protestant cause. This was not because France had come to accept the principle of religious tolerance within its own possessions, but because it feared the growing encroachment of the Habsburgs on French territories. The French made alliances with the Protestant countries of the Dutch Republic, Denmark and, most importantly, Sweden. Support for this alliance grew, as the religious element, and intolerance for the defeated, became increasingly prominent after 1629. The war that destroyed much of Germany over the next 19 years only came to an end in Westphalia in 1648. Peace was agreed, and the Habsburgs survived, bruised, after agreeing several principles. First, territory changed hands, with France and Sweden benefiting, and the Dutch Republic became a sovereign state and independent. Money was handed over to demobilise the armies and pay reparations. Finally, the sovereign autonomy of all members of the Holy Roman Empire was increased, including on the issue of religious tolerance, via a somewhat extended understanding of the *Peace of Augsburg*, as agreed nearly a century earlier.

Progress beckoned in the form of the three great thinkers of this period—Crucé, Sully and Grotius. These three men helped draft the blueprints for what ultimately became the League of Nations, the European Union and the United Nations, urging international cooperation and competition via commerce, not weapons. Grotius, the father of international law, would further condemn many of the traditional causes of war, going on to sketch a much more rational international order based on principles of tolerance, commerce and sovereignty, which could be found in peoples and not just monarchs.