



UNIVERSIDADE  
CATÓLICA  
PORTUGUESA

INSTITUTO DE  
ESTUDOS  
POLÍTICOS

**Mestrado em Ciência Política e Relações Internacionais:  
Segurança e Defesa. Variante de Relações Internacionais**

**Title:** Gloriana's Reign – Brutality, Deceit and Faith

**Subtitle:** A Quest for Survival

**Supervisor:** Professor Doutor Francisco Proença Garcia

**Student:** Afonso Moura - 100513007

February, 2016

## **I would like to thank...**

... personally:

Afonso José and Anabela (my sponsors)

El Comandante, Di John, JAC, Tinokh

Aurimas Okunaskas (may Hegel watch over us)

Julius Caesar and Napoléon Bonaparte

God and Spain which are one and the same

...academically:

all the professors I've had throughout my life

Professor Ivone Moreira for her aid and for solving a delicate situation.

Lieutenant Colonel Francisco Proença Garcia – without whom this would have been impossible – who had the courage and the honesty to see me through while my ship was engulfed in a terrible storm that menaced to sink it.

## Résumé

Europe, 1559: Elizabeth Tudor has just been crowned, the emperor renounced few years past and divided his dominions between his son Philip and his brother Ferdinand. The Habsburgs strived to implement the *Universal Monarchy* while Islam loomed along the horizon forming a huge crescent from Algiers to the gates of Vienna. The Protestant reformation had erupted into the scene producing a schism inside Western Christianity. England stood in a dire position, too poor, too remote, ravaged by internal conflicts because of the paradoxical reigns of Edward and Mary. Her future seemed to point towards submission but Elizabeth would have none of it; aided by ruthless pirates, competent bureaucrats and faithful partisans she was able to produce a strategy that would catapult England into independence and power. Her comprehension of the *rappports de force* and her gelid approach always focused on *raison d'état* above everything else managed to quell internal foes and defy external competitors. Gloriana, Walsingham and Drake formed the vertices of a complex triangle; their chores prevented the disintegration of the state and merged different forces to rally the national banner behind the same cause – to fight for queen and country. This thesis – shamelessly Machiavellian – narrates the kingdom's decisions from a strategic perspective and allows the reader to see that "*quando l'atto accusa, il risultato scusa.*"

(this dissertation has approximately 40.000 words)

# Contents

## 0 - Introduction (6)

## 1 - Before Elizabeth

1.1 - Europe according to Charles V (11)

1.2 - The Reformation (16)

1.3 - Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary I (21)

## 2 - A rough start

2.1 - Bring me back Calais (26)

2.2 - The French Puppets (31)

2.3 - Exploiting the Franco-Habsburg rivalry (36)

2.4 - The Dutch Question (41)

## 3 - Audacity

3.1 - Embracing the world (46)

3.2 - Ridolfi, Lepanto and Saint Bartholomew (51)

3.3 - Behind Enemy Lines (56)

3.4 - Imperator Totius Hispaniae (61)

3.5 - Divide and Conquer (66)

3.6 - One of a kind – El Draco (71)

3.7 - Walsingham – The Queen's most gifted Warlock (76)

3.8 - The Malevolent Witch (81)

## 4 - The Grand Finale

4.1 - By all means necessary (86)

4.2 - Dieu et mon droit (91)

4.3 - The Protestant Wind (96)

4.4 - The Successor (101)

## 5 - Conclusion

5.1 - Daughter of the Renaissance? (106)

Bibliography (111)

## 0 - Introduction

This work departed from: *"Assuming a Realist perspective, what leadership and strategic lessons can we extract from Elizabethan England?"* and evolved into: *How effective is guerrilla warfare? What role culture plays in international disputes? How important is propaganda? Geography is unchangeable, how crucial is it for a prince's strategy?* Throughout this dissertation I answer those four questions and in the end I highlight the answers succinctly.

I heavily relied on historical books that cover the period of Elizabeth's reign. Maps also accompanied me. Nevertheless I must state that this thesis is not in any way an historical work but an historicist one, my objective is to ponder about the leadership and strategic challenges faced by the monarch and her vassals. This thesis is based on secondary sources considering history and primary sources considering politics and strategy. I relied on a qualitative method, most specifically on narrative and ethnographic research.

My goal was to divide the several stages of Elizabeth's reign but while doing so I wanted to remain faithful to the chronological order. This led me to reach the conclusion of dividing the thesis roughly in 5 parts. I am obliged to talk of the events that preceded Elizabeth for the sake of contextualization, and that is the goal of the first part. Having this in mind this part is shorter than the following ones dealing with the start, the middle and the end of the Elizabethan Age. The fifth part was dedicated to the conclusions reached through the process of making the dissertation and will respond to the questions raised by the hypothesis.

My formula is directly derived from this Machiavellian citation: "Nevertheless, in order not to wipe out our free will, I consider it to be true that Fortune is the arbiter of one half of our actions, but that she still leaves the control of the other half, or almost that, to us."<sup>1</sup> I assume that half of everything is out of our control so we can only comprehend the other half. Inside the palpable half I analyze three key aspects: History, Geography

---

<sup>1</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 85

and Biology. I then engage in a process that studies Elizabeth's reign from a political and strategic prism, utilizing such formula.

We can divide the process of creating this document in three stages: Research, Selection and Compilation. During the first phase I got deeply acquainted with the Elizabethan Age (1558-1603) through books, classes, conferences and documentaries. The second phase led me through the selection of the best tomes I've found about Gloriana's reign. This intermediate phase is composed of a personal choice where I decided what citations would be contained in the thesis – these will make the reader aware of the particularities of the epoch. Then occurs a similar selection regarding the most apt strategic quotations with an assumed preference for Machiavelli. The composition was thence commenced, on that last part a fusion took place between the events of the reign and the political quotes I believe match such events. In a nutshell we can say that my narrative is inspired by Thucydides, my world is framed by Hobbes and my hand is guided by Machiavelli.

Discussing if universal moral principles exist seems to point towards a dead end – even if they do I am certain that for them to be applied they would have to be enforced and since there is no almighty entity to do so this remains unrealistic. This obliges us to comprehend that there is a clear distinction between politics and philosophy, while the aforementioned issue is very important for the latter we should be honest enough to acknowledge that it carries little weight for the former.

All authors depart, consciously or unconsciously, from either Hobbes, Locke or Rousseau – I will be no exception, departing from a Hobbesian perspective (regarding the state of nature). What I find interesting is the timelessness leadership and strategic challenges pose, the ways to wage war do change but the main principle remains – Surviving – my analysis will focus on the English will to endure.

Today in International Relations there are two big theories – Idealism and Realism. *Grosso modo* idealists see realists as warmongers that will bring doom to us all while realists see idealists as ingenuous folks that will lay the ground for disorder and destruction. This thesis is conceived by a realist so we will not dwell upon Idealism.

Realism has two distinct schools, human nature realism personified by Morgenthau and structural realism incarnated by Waltz. As the size of this document has a limit I cannot be too detailed nor too greedy; that's why I've picked Morgenthau and Waltz for I consider them the two most influential thinkers of the twentieth century.

Hans Morgenthau's opus *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (1948)* was an unmatched work during most of the XX century. In that tome he explains how humans are hardwired to live, procreate and dominate – *animus dominandi* – this is the core of international struggle. So far so good. I agree with Morgenthau when he doesn't shy away from the impact biology has in the process of constructing societies and afterwards their interactions, both peaceful and warlike. Morgenthau notes the difference between the national level and the international level; in the former he claims that a world of laws and hierarchy exists while in the latter he assumes the existence of a lawless and anarchical world. His international analysis holds true but he seems to give little importance to the different factions which might clash internally. The national level can be just as vile and volatile as the international arena, so I cannot agree with him on that important point.

The grand hiatus that occurs between me and Morgenthau is his take on morality. Since I am a faithful disciple of Machiavelli I am unable to grasp how can a leader be tempered by morality: "For there is such a distance between how one lives and how one ought to live, that anyone who abandons what is done for what ought to be done achieves his downfall rather than his preservation. A man who wishes to profess goodness at all times will come to ruin among so many who are not good. Therefore, it is necessary for a prince who wishes to maintain himself to learn how not to be good, and to use this knowledge or not to use it according to necessity."<sup>2</sup> A competent prince is guided by necessity alone, and when Morgenthau tries to render his narrative decent by imposing moral constraints upon it he contradicts himself.

Kenneth Waltz's opus *Theory of International Politics (1979)* broke Morgenthau's monopoly and installed a distinct realist school. His structuralism has as objective the isolation of international politics in order to be able to study them alone in their own

---

<sup>2</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 53

right. Such goal is attained and Waltz does not enter in complicated debates about human nature, he focus on the system as the main reason for international anarchy. Waltz's selective view does not necessarily separate him from Morgenthau regarding relations among states. His work is however less insightful when it comes to national matters unlike Morgenthau's work that has interesting information that can be salvaged and reapplied on an internal level.

Waltz is caught in a tidal wave called postmodernity and I don't believe he was aware that his kindhearted simplification would actually end up promoting values which he disliked. The absence of human nature in his work has nefarious effects, those of reducing everything to the social. This is well explained in that infamous phrase crafted by Simone de Beauvoir where she says that one is not born a woman but becomes one. Kenneth Waltz does speak about the importance of the distribution of power among those which are part of the anarchical system. On this point he is absolutely right, the world is ruled by those that have the power to do so. Waltz's structuralism simplifies the complexity of the problem to a bare minimum, relying too much on the anarchical system. I don't deny the importance of the anarchical system, that would be plain stupid, what I am trying to convey is that such simplification is uninterested with the different cultural traditions that shape how states conduct their behaviour and how different leaders have dissimilar objectives. That is why I state that a strong historical narrative is imperative to understand the reality in which the political forces operate in.

The best way to clarify how a state behaves is by getting acquainted with its core essence. For this we must read Machiavelli: "Contemporary examples of these two different kinds of governments are the Turk and the King of France. One ruler governs the entire kingdom of the Turk; the others are his servants; and dividing his kingdom with sanjaks, he sends various administrators there, and he moves them and changes them around as he pleases. But the King of France is placed among a group of hereditary nobles who are recognized in that state by their subjects and who are loved by them; they have their hereditary privileges, which the King cannot take away without endangering himself. Anyone, then, who considers the one and the other of these two states will find that for the Turk the difficulty lies in taking possession of the state, but once it has been conquered it is very simple to hold on to it. And so (on the other hand),

you will find that in some respects it is easier to occupy the Kingdom of France, but extremely difficult to hold on to it."<sup>3</sup>

I conclude by resuming that I had to come up with a formula to study international relations (the one which was mentioned previously) for both Morgenthau and Waltz could not satisfy me. Morgenthau is too moderate and restrictive, Waltz is too specific and reductionist (which is his goal but this ends up being more malign than benign). They both undermine the historical and geographical elements which have a fundamental say in the actions that are pursued. Both authors are not sensible to the power of *Fortuna* which induces into the world events which are out of our control and take place without any apparent cause or logical explanation: "Again, I want to affirm it as being very true, according to what can be seen in all the histories, that men can side with fortune but not oppose her; they can weave her warp but they cannot tear it apart. They must never give up, for without knowing her goals as she moves along paths both crossed and unknown, men always have to hope, and with hope, they should never give up, no matter what the situation or the difficulty in which they find themselves."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 17

<sup>4</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book II* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 236

# 1 - Before Elizabeth

## 1.1 - Europe According to Charles V

Many kind souls tend to think that the most powerful force of the twenty-first century is democracy, unlike the sixteenth century when humanity was almost primitive concerning today's standards and cannons. This is a utopia, in both centuries mentioned previously the main driving force was identity, hence nationalism. During the reign of Charles V Vienna (1529) stood between the Ottoman Empire and a road to the heart of Europe; it was a battle far more complex than the de facto capital of the Habsburg dynasty against an expansionist empire. It was a confrontation between two different ways of life, Vienna stood as the shield of all Christians against the eastern invader that had already claimed all the Balkans but was still unsatisfied, the will to spread Islam was great and unrelenting. Charles V had inherited from his grandparents four polities that represented each one of them: The Kingdom of Castile, the Kingdom of Aragon, the Burgundian lands and the Habsburg lands. During the dispute at Vienna he represented Christianity while his rival, Suleiman the Magnificent, represented Islam, they were the two most powerful sovereigns of the first half of the sixteenth century. This military might was only possible due to the tremendous competence of both administrations.<sup>5</sup> During Elizabeth's reign things won't be that different from this time, the epoch of her father, Henry VIII – England was very feeble in comparison to the Spanish and Ottoman Empires – and if there was anyone capable of challenging Spanish supremacy in Western Europe it was France, certainly not England. It is on this circumstances that Elizabeth will be crowned in 1559, but she had other plans for her beloved nation, she would envision a world where England did not bow, neither to the French nor to the Spaniards.

The strategic challenges Charles faced during his reign were innumerable, a geographical analysis is mandatory to better fathom them. In the south his fleet often clashed against the Ottoman vessels or its north African tributaries. In the east (Vienna) the Holy Roman Empire stood as strongly as it could against the Ottoman Empire by land. The spread of Protestantism was another problem he had to deal with. In the West

---

<sup>5</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book I* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 30

Francis I of France always tried to break the Habsburg encirclement and flirted often with Suleiman, this produced the Franco-Ottoman alliance.

This unholy alliance came as a shock to many pious men in Europe, but it shouldn't have because when the existence of a polity is severely threatened its ruler won't hesitate to ally himself with the Devil if need be to stop it from falling into the abyss. The enemy of my enemy is my friend, this has always been the case and it shall always be the case, France had already aligned herself with Scotland to pester England during the Middle Ages. Furthermore in the future this would continue to be the case such as when Richelieu engaged in a pact with the Protestant Swedes or when Charles de Gaulle recognized Russia and China believing their old roots would eventually consume the communist plague. This realist approach based on your own forces and on intelligent alliances is the only viable option to keep your enemies at bay and your sovereignty intact.<sup>6</sup>

One of the main problems the king of Spain suffered was the immensity of his dominions and their geographical discontinuity, one should not forget that the Castilian crown had also possessions in the New World, and they were really valuable since they provided gold, silver and other precious cargo to keep the Spanish war machine afloat. One of the difficulties felt by Charles V was the passage between Spain and Italy, the French always tried to disrupt his vessels, and the Turk loomed along the horizon as well; but the Aragonese armada was very compact and patrolled the areas between the Iberian and Italian peninsulas with a huge sense of duty and remarkable competence. This armada operated on a triangular operation that had a twofold objective: Curtail the French presence in the Mediterranean and give the Ottomans no quarter. The three most important bases were: the eastern coast of Spain (preeminence to Barcelona), Naples and Sicily. The French and Spaniards had been embroiled in conflicts concerning Naples in the past, but fortunately for Charles during his reign Francis could not project power on the lower part of the Apennine Peninsula, this however didn't stop him from causing mayhem on the northern areas.

---

<sup>6</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 48

To fully grasp the importance of Naples and Sicily one must see those two areas as a frontier zone, moving east hostile territory was a certainty. The Eastern Mediterranean was dominated by the sultan and no wise Christian prince dared to launch an operation there besides the Venetians that had all sort of filthy deals with the Orientals. The Western part of the Mediterranean was largely tamed by Spain, and even if the south was Muslim territory their power had been wavering for centuries and although they harassed Spanish domains sporadically they were just pirates and thugs – without Ottoman support they could not launch a decent operation nor a dramatic blow.

Farther north the French and the unruly Protestants kept posing challenges to Habsburg primacy, which led to the idea of calming the French with a marriage alliance that would make room for peace but would cost the Netherlands or Milan, the following debate occurred:

"The duke of Alba and Cobos, both military men, contended that Milan was strategically essential to the defense of Spain, Sicily, and Naples. The majority on the council, however, including Tavera and Zúñiga, argued that the Netherlands were too important to the economy of Spain ever to be relinquished or lost. Charles accepted the majority's decision, but the matter became an empty issue when the duke of Orléans died in September 1545 while the marriage negotiations were still going on. The debate and decision-making process, however, had provided Philip the means by which he would reach decisions in the future."<sup>7</sup>

It is often said that there are only bad choices in International Relations, the most capable leaders opt for the least bad of them all. One can clearly see here one example that sustains such premise, which to pick, Milan or the Netherlands? The Netherlands certainly provided a great marketplace, with booming enterprises and an advanced way of life for its time; Milan, as the military men pointed out, was in a crucial position to balance possible incursions into the south. Analyzing the two possibilities I must side with Alba and Cobos: firstly Milan provided a solid base to rest and rearm in an ever-changing northern Italy that could easily fall prey to a Valois incursion. Secondly it served as a primordial place for intercepting messages from the Ottomans to the French

---

<sup>7</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 31

and vice versa via the always untrustworthy Venetians, the sultan's lapdogs. Thirdly it was the departing point of the Spanish Road, which allowed the projection of power into Eastern France, the Low Countries and the Holy Roman Empire.

Clausewitz taught us that: "War is to be regarded not as an independent thing, but as a political instrument"<sup>8</sup>this means that a wise ruler understands the limits of war; a victory on the battlefield must always be followed by a political capitulation which should provide the victor with plausible political advantages. Charles V knew the weakest point of his enormous empire, its vastness made it impossible to deliver a clear, targeted and swift response to the several problems that kept spawning. This led the monarch to a magnanimous decision: the division of his Empire in two; his brother Ferdinand would get the Austrian lands and occupy the position he always had within the Empire. Most of Charles' territories passed to his son, Philip II of Spain. His offspring would retain the Crown of Castile and Aragon plus the *Milanesado*, the Franche-Comté and the Low Countries. So in 1556, 3 years before the ascension of Elizabeth to the English throne, Philip had his domains chosen by his father.

Realist doctrine stresses the fact that there is an intemporality on the vectors being analyzed, it is sustained by the Machiavellian thought that men are greedy and malefic and harbors the need to be inundated by the specificity of the epoch being studied. Having that in mind I will bear the subsequent advice: "To keep the discussion grounded I have kept in mind Raymond Aron's observation about how strategic thought 'draws its inspiration from each century, or rather at each moment of history, from the problems which events themselves pose.' "<sup>9</sup>The transition from Charles V to Philip II has a paramount importance since it reveals the new knowledge that England and France were able to harvest from the Habsburgs. The passage of time permitted a comprehension of the Spanish Empire which undermined Philip's strengths and illuminated his weaknesses – Elizabeth would not let these novelties go unrealized, she would foster dissent among the integrity of her enemies whenever she could, incrementing the pressure on an already wounded body.

---

<sup>8</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 14

<sup>9</sup> Freedman, Lawrence. *Strategy: A History* (Oxford University Press, USA; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2013) page 15

Unity and a monolithic façade are far more susceptible to endure continual attacks than diversity and a pluralistic composition. The power of the Habsburg dynasty, from Charles V until the aftermath of World War I was always in peril due to its heterogeneous essence. Human history proves that most of the times men have been called to arms to defend an identity, this objective might of course not be how the individuals throughout history saw their role; many were attracted to notions completely dissociated with the preservation of one's identity such as pure adventure, economical profit or social emancipation. While I accept this view it is undeniable that whatever the driving force behind the individual was the result ended up being the same: the consolidation of an already existing identity or its replacement by a new one.

I would assert that the Habsburg dynasty in general saw itself as the bulwark against the expansion of Islam, a difficult and exhausting task that they were able to fulfill when the Ottoman Empire was at the highest of its potency. Their success did not come without a cost, and a very high one, the successive fragmentation of their authority within the European universe. The Kingdom of France and Francis were playing the long game, they were aware of the heterogeneous presence within Charles' fiefs. The French focused ferociously in stamping out differences and hence reinforcing their power. Francis might have been beaten by Charles on the battlefield, having even been his prisoner, but when it came to affairs of state he cannot be discarded as incompetent. The Ordinance of Villers-Cotterêts promulgated in 1539 stated that henceforth French would replace Latin as the language of the administration, limiting the influence of the several dialects spoken in France at the time and consequently reinforcing the authority of the state, reducing the possibility of fifth columns. At the stroke of a pen the king of France was capable of decisively shaping the future of Europe and therefore the world by excelling at his position with the means he had at his disposal: "So the realm of strategy is one of bargaining and persuasion as well as threats and pressure, psychological as well as physical effects, and words as well as deeds. This is why strategy is the central political art. It is about getting more out of a situation than the starting balance of power would suggest. It is the art of creating power."<sup>10</sup> The English would imitate the French, the most efficient frustrating Spanish aspirations.

---

<sup>10</sup> Freedman, Lawrence. Strategy: A History (Oxford University Press, USA; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2013) page 11-12

## 1.2 - The Reformation

If you want to be romantic you would affirm that the German Nation-State commenced when Arminius ambushed the Romans in the Teutoburg Forest, if you want to be realistic you would point to one man – Martin Luther. Whether Luther was a pious man or not is not my concern. His audacious deeds did open a huge wound on what we know as Western Christianity, considering the divide between Rome and Constantinople that took place in 1054. Luther's cause was rapidly recuperated by political men that were eager to disrupt Roman domination over the Holy Roman Empire, unshackling their lands from the Papacy would mean more autonomy, greater liberty and fuller coffers.

Luther had been struggling with his faith for most of his life, always feeling that he was not worthy enough but at the same time blaming not only himself but the institutions that sustained God's message. His critical analysis and obstinate procedure made him a dangerous foe for all those that wanted to maintain things as they were, regardless of their purity or truthfulness. The moment when Luther travelled to Rome was the journey where he discovered himself, hoping that the voyage and contact with the Papal reasoning would squash his doubts, enlighten his soul and dissipate his sorrow all the contrary occurred. His uncertainties were amplified, his soul remained astray and his anguish mounted: "Further disillusionment came when he was one of two monks sent to represent the Erfurt monastery at a meeting in Rome, arriving there on foot in January 1511. During the months he was there, like the devout pilgrim that he was, he took in the sights and activities of the holy city, which was a lot less holy than what he was expecting. He was appalled by the corruption, licentiousness, hypocrisy, irreverence, and blasphemy, within the church and without."<sup>11</sup> Luther was caught in a tidal wave he did not fully comprehend; in the beginning of the sixteenth century he had planted the seed that would calmly but surely grow into the majestic tree that Bismarck would empower into a unified Germany. Luther's use of the common tongue instead of Latin allowed the decisive attachment to the German language, and it is clear that a state which is not sustained by its own culture shall never be dominant.

---

<sup>11</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 138

The Papacy was well aware of the difficulties the future was bound to bring, the network of its power was strong near the source but it diminished as it drifted away from it. The greatest servants of Christ were the Portuguese, the Spaniards, the French and the Austrians. The Portuguese were too far away to have a definitive stake protecting the Papal States, being on the western edge of Europe they had the Spanish strength to keep them safe from the Mediterranean disputes. Geography favored French apathy too, their position was not too compromised and they were happy whenever Spanish or Austrian authority decreased, thence Paris would provide the same help as Lisbon. His Holiness' strategy was then increasingly relying on Viennese fiber and Aragonese courage to curb the Ottoman menace.

Luther was the champion of all those areas that were very remote by sixteenth century standards, the northern and eastern zones of the Holy Roman Empire, Scandinavia and Livonia. The Low Countries were not as remote as the areas mentioned previously but their cultured, dynamic and entrepreneurial society did not see with good eyes the southern impositions and resented the lack of its importance within Christendom.

The reason why the Ninety-five theses succeeded while past tries by other preoccupied men did not was the political backing they received. Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony, realized the possibilities of a brilliant theology professor he employed in Wittenberg. Frederick's influence near Charles V was crucial in granting Luther a fair trial and protecting Germanic interests in opposition to Popish intransigence. The Holy See had a strategy to silence Luther as fast as it could, but since Saxony was too boreal to accept Papal desires without a fight it wasn't as easy to complete the plan as it would have been in France or Spain. Germania maintained freedom constantly on its inner essence, the people had a collective memory of resistance against the Roman Legions, the pagan remnants were vibrant and the necessity to resist grander, the Emperor was in many aspects impotent. Voltaire would say one day that the Holy Roman Empire wasn't Holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire but Machiavelli had already alerted us about Germanic liberty: "The cities of Germany are completely independent, they control little surrounding territory, they obey the emperor when they please, and they fear neither him nor any other nearby power."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 38

The international system was then just like it is now, there was no authority above the states, the system was anarchical and the main goal of every polity was survival. It is mandatory to discern the place the Papal States had on this game that included spheres of influence and imminent threats. Ever since Alaric the Visigoth had sacked Rome in 410 and the collapse of the Western Roman Empire was then certain the history of Western Europe took an unexpected turn. In the Byzantine Empire the Emperor always controlled the Patriarch, religious creed was subjugated to imperial resolution, Caesaropapism was strongly enshrined. In the West there was no Emperor to appoint the Patriarch like in the East, so the Vicar of Christ was not under any terrestrial ruler – and perhaps even more interesting, he was a political ruler himself – being granted full autonomy.

The Pope had what I will call cultural sway, and he is the perfect example to explain why cultural sway is as ancient as civilization itself. If there is one notion we can extract from Luther's life is that ideas play an undeniable role in shaping the hearts and minds of the common people, hence having the support of the rabble is always a good sign.<sup>13</sup>

His Sanctity provided the entrance into a field of possibilities to all those rulers that sought credibility, namely the Ostrogoths in the Italian Peninsula, the Visigoths in the Iberian Peninsula and the Franks in Gaul. The political leaders of Western Europe had a mutual beneficial contract with the Pope, a relationship that was as symbiotic as the one between a rhino and a bird. The rhino represents the Pope, his pose and size empowers the birds that represent the leaders, they eliminate the bacteria that damage the rhino. The Reformation succeeded in cutting the umbilical connection between the Pope and the Protestant leaders. Such event announced the political decay of the Papal States, that became weaker and weaker throughout the times and ultimately culminated into the absorption of the state into the newborn Italian Kingdom, in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The necessity to belong to a group, to feel similar to your peers, to be able to rally the banners for a common cause is what defines identity. The Pontifical States (one of the most important states of Italy until their dissolution) did not have big military prowess, a booming economy nor a privileged geographical position but they were nourished by their history, Roman legend and Saint Peter's seat: cultural sway.

---

<sup>13</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book II* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 223

Another interesting aspect of the Reformation was how it spread far more easily in places that were geographically shielded from Islam, indeed, Portugal, Spain and the Italian States were not so keen in adopting this new ideas, whether Lutheranism or Calvinism. Cynics are prompt in disregarding this as a suggestion of the former's privileged status within the Christian Cosmos, namely the division of the areas of influence outside Europe between the Portuguese and the Castilians. But this is only half-true, it is required to see the dangers that both states faced. Remembering the occupation during the times of Al-Andalus, having experienced the knowledge and marvels of Islam the Iberians did experience its cruelty and segregation too and they were not interested in repeating the dose. Unity was crucial, without it there was no hope of enduring the vile obstacles posed by the enemies of the state, when your existence is at risk you give up all high morals and hopeless idealisms to guarantee your safety: "Survival must be the highest objective; otherwise nothing could be achieved. This required the prince to vary his conduct according to changing circumstance, including a readiness to act immorally whenever necessary."<sup>14</sup>

If the Berber Coast was alarming enough, imagine how the Italian States saw the speedy incursion of the Ottomans in the Balkans and you rapidly realize that there was no time for disunion there either. The Italian Peninsula stood in a very complicated spot, geography proved to be once again central to the equation; geography is a variable that is always present in every detailed calculation.

The two cases discussed above witness the obligation a leader has to never ever let go of geography. A competent leader must always depart from a solid internal situation if he wants to leave his mark outside his polity. Planning in advance should always be practiced, try out the possible combinations that the future might reserve and conceive a strategy for each one of them. There are three possible routes that can be chosen: support, undermine or observe. When you choose to support anything you can send money, men or intelligence to the doer. When you opt to undermine you can do it alone or in a concerted operation with an ally, once again providing him with gold, soldiers or information. The last option is to observe the events without undermining or supporting them, this stance permits to join the winning side whenever you see fit or counter-

---

<sup>14</sup> Freedman, Lawrence. *Strategy: A History* (Oxford University Press, USA; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2013) page 52

balance against the winning party because you fear their hegemony. The problem the last choice has is the weakness that your inactivity might transmit to the other states or their unwillingness to let you participate further within the campaign or even the final agreement between the involved parts not taking into worry your preoccupations and possibly reducing your sphere of influence (or in a harsher case reducing your territory).

The Reformation was irreversible since 1530, when Charles V summoned his supposed vassals to the city of Augsburg, in a desperate last attempt to establish Catholicism as the sole possible denomination within the Holy Roman Empire. The Protestant rulers presented Charles with the Augsburg Confession, a document that was created both in Latin and German which shed light on the similarities and differences between the two doctrinal ways. When words do not suffice it is of the utmost importance the resort to arms. Shortly after the lack of understanding came war, which would end with the Peace of Augsburg of 1555. There it was decided that Lutheranism would have the same importance as Catholicism within the Empire and the application of *cuius regio, eius religio* would be respected henceforth.

The settlement of 1555 did not grant legitimacy to the other Protestant faiths, only Lutheranism. There were some quite radical theories such as the ones which the Anabaptists cherished but the other most influential one was Calvinism. Calvinism is as important as Lutheranism to fully fathom the political strife during the reign of queen Elizabeth I of England. Lutheranism, Calvinism and Anglicanism were intertwined between them and their main political result was common: the renouncement of Papal rule. Nevertheless there were doctrinal and terrestrial dissimilarities that stopped them from melting into one. The name Lutheranism is composed from Luther and Calvinism is hatched from Calvin, but Anglicanism does not sprout from an individual's name but from Anglia – England. This is truly absolute to comprehend that in Anglicanism the political preceded the religious, what did not happen in the other two. This profound gap between them is satisfactory to admit the strategic implications that England would face. England did not have a Luther to enamor the people and make them see the light, England was not ready for the change the purists chanted for, England would suffer the consequences of extremisms like no other European Nation-State of the time with the paradoxical rules of Edward VI and Mary I.

### 1.3 - Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary I

From a staunch protector of Catholicism, what earned him the title *Fidei Defensor*, to a late Protestant reformer – Henry VIII – he was the ruler that started the transformation of England that Elizabeth would in due time inherit; Henry's case clearly shows the ambiguity of leading, the need to be always aware of every single detail and the requirement of the strength to implement change whenever it is deemed mandatory – necessity is the mother of all musts.

Henry was stuck with a wife that would not produce a lasting male heir and this was a hard strike on his reputation, unable to have a son that could lead England after his death, and even more damaging on his legacy. His work named *Defence of the Seven Sacraments* was a landmark assuming he would be one of the Pope's Henchmen oriented towards combating new doctrinal ideas but when the circumstances were modified so was the English monarch's word: "A wise ruler, therefore, cannot and should not keep his word when such an observance would be to his disadvantage, and when the reasons that caused him to make a promise are removed. If men were all good, this precept would not be good. But since men are a wicked lot and will not keep their promises to you, you likewise need not keep yours to them."<sup>15</sup> This behavioral shift came about when he could not get an annulment from His Sanctity. Catherine of Aragon was the aunt of the most powerful man in Europe – Charles V. This halted any possibility of success because the Holy See would never side with Henry in detriment of Charles. Being aware of his finite existence Henry sought another wife to provide him with what his first had not and since he had received a firm no from the Papacy he felt that his obligation to maintain his fierce opposition to the Reformation was now gone – the pact had been broken – it was then time to study new courses of action.

What Henry had felt as a depravation and a possible chaotic beginning with Martin Luther's thoughts he then saw with different eyes; if Rome wasn't going to provide him with any joys he would look for them elsewhere and being the sole ruler of his realm without having to deal with Papal wishes sounded very good. The Act of Supremacy of 1534 claimed that from that moment on the English sovereigns were going to be the

---

<sup>15</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 60

heads of their Church, only God would be above them. This act allowed the King to recuperate to the crown massive amounts of lands and taxes that were until then property of the Catholic Church, this greatly reinforced the power of the leader because he would add to his reputation without diminishing his revenues. This was accomplished by providing his followers with riches that were never his, he simply took possession of them and rapidly handed them over.<sup>16</sup>

Geopolitically speaking Henry VIII was aware that his renouncement prohibited the Catholics from having a big foothold in the north, this would be key throughout most of English (and afterwards British) history; the edgy isle that had in the past been subject to several continental incursions and conquests would nevermore fall prey to the Continentals. England was very peripheral but at the same time it was on the right side of the periphery, the Atlantic side. Overall the English lost less than the Catholic family did, without England's help to asphyxiate Huguenots in France and Calvinists in the Low Countries the task was harder than initially perceived, and if it is true that France succeeded in hunting down all Protestants the Netherlands did not. Worse than not having English support was having its enmity. Being on the right side of the periphery was crucial to reach prosperity, the English knew that there were worlds ready to be subdued and pillaged beyond the Atlantic – Geography – their unquenchable desire to be part of this new era was primordial in their success. England benefitted from her position, far less protected than Saxony, way less stable than Pomerania, massively less isolated than Livonia but more promising than all those three combined. Many of the innovations and daring decisions taken by Elizabeth regarding the role of the Tudor Navy was a continuation of a work her father had begun. Gloriana's father reinvented a polity that was too complex for the young Edward to grasp and too ambitious for the submissive Mary to preserve, only the Virgin Queen would act as boldly, cunningly and decisively as her father did. There is a direct semblance between Elizabeth's fortitude and her father's impetuosity, as there is a profound proximity between her mother's finesse or seductive tricks with her obstinate policy of grandeur. Henry had had the boy he craved for but the future would be dramatically different from what he had imagined, Fortune had other plans.

---

<sup>16</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 56

After the long reign of Henry VIII (1509-1547) came the short reign of his much wanted son Edward VI (1547-1553). This was the first time England had a ruler that had been raised as a Protestant. Only 9 when he ascended to the throne Edward was never fully in charge, older men with proper agendas used his reign to further their causes and the child had mainly a symbolic value because in truth he was a mere puppet. The most influential of all those men was Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, whom had as objective the removal of what he saw as Papal remnants within the Anglican Church. During Henry VIII's reign we assisted to a balance between the conservatives and the progressists but his son's rule was marked by the enduring Protestant character, forgetting any sort of deal between the several camps.

Cranmer wanted to create a new worshipping method and he partly did it with the introduction of the Book of Common Prayer (1549) which used the English tongue in detriment of Latin. This book was able to please the more Protestant minded individuals but it failed in providing the same result for the followers of the old doctrine, the outcome was indeed messy and perilous. Instead of opting for a unifying strategy young Edward was more interested in doctrinal purity in the place of fair government, his soft stance and malleability showed how easy it sometimes is to influence and even give orders to a leader. This abruptness was worrying many on the continent, there were rumors and confirmations about the fragile health of the English king and there was also an intense will to restore England to the Catholic flock.

Edward VI reminds us all of the maturity one has to have in order to be a good chief and how it is highly improbable that an adolescent is within the required parameters. Political decisions must always be inside the realm of commitment in order to endure and outlast their crafters, every so often religious men are driven by religious concerns only and they give little attention to the possible side effects produced by their modifications. You cannot serve more than one master at the same time, if you let your religious convictions defile the love for your Nation-State you are part of a possible fifth column. On his deathbed Edward declared Lady Jane Grey as his successor in the name of Protestant continuity, this might have worked if his policies had not been so radical and if he had tried to formulate some sort of agreement but since this was not the case he simply announced Grey's death knell.

Elizabeth's half-sister was going to be the first queen regnant England ever had, history would remind her as Blood Mary because of her uncontrollable obsession to revive Catholicism and what that meant for her opponents: "John Rogers, vicar of Saint Sepulchre's Church in London, whose sermons warned his congregation against popery, idolatry, and superstition – all associated with the practice of Catholicism – was imprisoned at Newgate Prison, then burned at the stake at Smithfield, in northeast London, in February 1555, the first religious martyr of Mary's reign."<sup>17</sup> Mary did not hesitate in revoking all laws that sustained the new religious forms that denied Papal authority, after Edward's intense reform England would suffer Mary's fierce counter-reform. Mary's unwillingness or lack of need to reach a deal damaged her more than what she initially thought, she was unable to see that her faith clouded her reasoning and obstructed her religious goals, darkness soon engulfed her chances of success.

Mary Tudor had received the support of some Protestants before her accession when she reminded them that she was Henry VIII's daughter whilst others were not. When she started to cleanse her realm from the Protestant sickness she soon lost the backing of many of those that had believed she would seek a compromise. Her decision to marry Charles V's son, that would later be known as Philip II of Spain, delivered the *coup de grâce* on her already shaky reputation. Elizabeth's life was in a truly precarious position when many pointed to her as a rallying point for discontent Englishmen and as a more than possible conspirator against the queen. Considering all this it remains a mystery why Elizabeth remained alive, some believe it was because of her sister's mercy, others opt for a more disconcerting reality; if Elizabeth were to die and Mary would produce no heir the English crown would pass to Mary Queen of Scots. This was an alarming possibility for the Spaniards seeing the obvious approximation that would take place between England and France (Mary had had a French upbringing and was married to France). This alliance would provide the French with much needed help to contain the Habsburgs so it had to be avoided at all costs. Elizabeth was a Protestant but a far better candidate to occupy the English throne than someone that would conceive a plan with the French to ravage Spanish ambition. This is a solid proof that no matter how religious one is, which was certainly the case of Philip, one has to uphold the *raison d'état* above all other affiliations, even those that contemplate eternity.

---

<sup>17</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 56

Mary I of England demonstrated a complete lack of understanding how human nature works; when she tried to regain the lands her father had stolen from the monasteries and kindly distributed to his followers she was shocked with the resistance and determinacy its new owners were able to muster but she should have not been:

"A prince must nevertheless make himself feared in such a way that he will avoid hatred, even if he does not acquire love; since one can very easily be feared and yet not hated. This will always be the case when he abstains from the property of his citizens and subjects, and from their women. If he must spill someone's blood, he should do this when there is proper justification and manifest cause. But above all else, he should abstain from seizing the property of others; for men forget the death of their father more quickly than the loss of their patrimony."<sup>18</sup>

Mary's ability to irritate her subjects was constant and had a prolific vitality which doomed her reign since its very initiation. Two years before Mary's last breath her husband had taken the spot of his father and the great-grandson of Ferdinand and Isabella (like them before him) did not succumb to Popish caprices; Pope Paul IV entered an alliance with the French King, Henry II, to break Spanish power in Italy but he would be completely crushed by the Duke of Alba: "He would either acquiesce to the pope's aggression and give up territory, or else make war on the papacy, an unthinkable act for so staunch a defender of Catholicism as Philip was. He decided not to acquiesce. 'I am determined to maintain all my realms,' he declared."<sup>19</sup>

England was eventually dragged into the conflict which Spain and France were having and before the war ceased with the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis the English were left out in the open, alone, against French might. The result was catastrophic, the last memory of Bloody Mary's Kingdom was the loss of Calais, the last stronghold the Perfidious Albion held on the continent. The reign of Mary Tudor was the last one which saw English objectives subjugated to French or Spanish foreign policy, the daughter of Anne Boleyn was not the daughter of Catherine of Aragon, Good Queen Bess was going to pursue another type of strategy.

---

<sup>18</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed., 2008) page 58

<sup>19</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 80

## 2 - A rough start

### 2.1 - Bring me back Calais

Mary's demise was a certainty, Elizabeth's time was about to begin. Gloriana had been patient, she had been waiting for Fortune's verdict to summon her to the highest position of the realm. She could have played her hand too soon, being blinded by power and recognition; but during most of Elizabeth's life, before and after she was queen, she opted more often than not for a passive posture which wouldn't compromise her. The start of what we now know as the Elizabethan Age had a very symbolic theme: "Her prayers were apparently answered, for after hearing a private Mass said for her, she fell into a final sleep and died peacefully sometime between four and five o'clock on the morning of November 17, 1558. From St. James Palace the news was swiftly carried to Elizabeth at Hatfield, eighteen miles away 'This is the Lord's doing,' she said slipping to her knees and quoting from Psalm 118, 'and it is marvelous in our eyes.'"<sup>20</sup> She pronounced such phrase not in English but in Latin, the language that bound most of Europe culturally united. It was during her reign that England would depart definitely from Papal authority but interestingly enough she didn't abandon Roman sapience, England was the only country of those which had been Romanized that deserted Catholicism, unlike France and all the other states in the Iberian and Italian peninsulas.

On January 15, 1559 Elizabeth was crowned, she would rule from that year until her last hours in 1603. Elizabeth's coronation marked the end of a decaying period in English history, after her half-sister's marriage England had been raped by Spain, from within, the moment was now at hand to resurrect the proper but forgotten procedures: "As for the first means, it is evident how necessary it was for Rome to have been taken by the Gauls in order for it to be reborn, and in being reborn, to take on new life and new vigour and to take up once again the observance of religion and of justice, which were beginning to become corrupt."<sup>21</sup> Being caught in an astonishing defeat is never good *per se* but it can open the possibility of an improved future.

---

<sup>20</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 31

<sup>21</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book III* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 246

There are moments in history that supplant the brevity of the moment itself, moments that make or break a people, a culture, a state. The loss of Calais was one of those occasions. This was the first challenge Elizabeth had to surpass, the milieu was not hopeful, England's loss seemed to point towards greater and greater fragility and not solidity and impertinence: "Yet it was the loss of Calais that represented the greatest threat to Elizabeth's people. Not only was it catastrophic in terms of the national pride, but, more important, Calais was the primary staple town of all English merchant staple exporters, as it was where they had their wool spun."<sup>22</sup>

The main players were not helping Good Queen Bess either, the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis meant that France and Spain would stop consuming each other's energies and could perhaps focus more than what she wanted on England. Calais was a remnant of the Hundred Years' War, a city of vital strategic importance for England. Economically because it was a very good place to trade and browse for goods. It was close to the Spanish Netherlands which were an intense marketplace. But its importance was far bigger than economic, it was a prime spot for safe disembark of all the English troops that might be called to arms somewhere on Continental Europe. Its proximity to Dover provided the English with a privileged control over the Narrow Sea and gave them a grand advantage compared with any other country. Geography also spoke out the obvious: it would be easy to defend if a competent government was governing, which was not the case when it was lost, queen Mary I saw England through Catholic lenses so she could not discern what was better for her Nation-State. Psychologically speaking it was a permanent stain on the king of France, something that reminded him of English triumphs and achievements. This gave heed to a much broader reality: if the king of France, which was one of the most powerful men of that time, could not conquer Calais back it had to mean that England wasn't as feeble and parochial as many on the continent believed.

Everything was then against Gloriana, her reputation had been tarnished, her vaults sacked, her pride wounded. The sole palpable future for her land seemed to be one of submission and apathy, torment and despair but she did not accept such omen, if England was going to be weakened it would be because she tried everything at her

---

<sup>22</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 6

disposal and even then she had not been successful. Her chances of success were never enormous, but she seemed to have the knowledge to maximize them as much as she could, revealing herself to be a prudent ruler, whose intelligence preceded Jesus Christ. The following quote enables us to see a statement she shared: " ' In my opinion the two greatest impediments to good decision-making are haste and anger. Anger is the fellow of folly, and haste the sign of ignorance and shallow judgement' ."<sup>23</sup>

Elizabeth I masterfully extinguished the extremes that could have tore her country apart, the Elizabethan Religious Settlement of 1558-59 was imbued with three things dear to the monarch: Pragmatism, Nationalism and Conservatism. Nobody ever captured its essence as good as Andrew Norman Wilson: "She wanted the ministers of the Sacrament in the Church of England to wear chasubles at the Eucharistic table because she wanted Henry VIII's Anglo-Catholic religion – Catholicism translated into English, Catholicism without the Pope – to be the norm."<sup>24</sup> She was pragmatic due to the fact that she was able to reduce her needs to the essential and lower her idealism, to strike a commitment, to work within what was feasible. She was devoutly nationalistic, her acts proved that her primary goal was to foster the strengthening of her polity and weakening that of others. Her most striking feature was Conservatism, not for a single second was she tempted to engage on a revolution that could eradicate what was functioning to trade it for other supposedly more effective structure.

Good Queen Bess kept an attentive regard on the Papists and on the Puritans, known at the time as the hotter sort of Protestants, during all the period she reigned. Opting not to appoint radical Protestants for important jobs when she could select more moderate ones. Those that had their hearts in Rome were far more dangerous than the frustrated reformists which sought bigger change, this was so due to the geopolitical situation during the sixteenth century. The Puritans could hardly get any help from foreign powers but the Catholics counted on deliverance from either the Spaniards or the French; for this reason throughout Elizabeth's rule the situation for Papal followers did not improve with the passage of the decades, the contrary occurred, their situation kept worsening. Vassals which had other objective in mind which was not English independence were rapidly confronted with the new reality, one should not let fade from

---

<sup>23</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 149

<sup>24</sup> Wilson, A.N.. *The Elizabethans* (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) pages 67-68

memory the meddling of the government to pass the Religious Settlement through the House of Lords. This house was not convinced with the Religious Settlement so when the vote took place, Elizabeth's cabinet made sure that the bill would pass, removing from the scene highly probable rejecters – stopping them from attending the session. Necessity obliged her to break her laws in order to uphold her maxims.

The constant thorn on Gloriana's regime was Ireland, her rule lived magnanimous victories but it could never tame the Irish, that in the twentieth century finally broke free from the English yoke – ironically enough sponsored by the United States of America.

It is important to retain that what the Irish despised was the enterprise conceived to destroy their culture and impregnate them with other which they felt was exotic: "Outside the Pale – that is, the small area twenty miles to the east and north of Dublin that was English-speaking – Ireland had its own language, literature, culture. The Reformation bishops were bidden to preach to the people in English, a language understood by Irish congregations no better than they understood Latin. But it was not Protestantism *per se* that the Irish rejected, it was English cultural imperialism, which had been just as strong in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth."<sup>25</sup> Both sides engaged in battle used religion to justify the justice of their cause in opposition to their heretic rivals. This is a formidable example of how important religions are, not religiously speaking but considering culture. Religions are often a part of who we are, they shape our identity and testify where our folk commences and terminates, they help us clarify who we are and who are the others. Ever since Henry VIII's reign when England forsook Rome's authority the Irish had seen themselves more Catholic than ever, their preoccupations were not so much religious but simply practical – they understood how remaining within the Papal sphere of influence could provide them with help from the powerful Catholic countries. Ireland would sometimes be regarded by the Spanish Empire as a possible tip of the spear to neutralize English aggression but the Castilians never really committed fully to this strategy. Fortunately for Elizabeth the Scottish dilemma turned out in her favour, I don't think she could have survived a dual struggle against the Irish and the Scots, in due time I will explain what made the Scottish case different from the Irish one.

---

<sup>25</sup> Wilson, A.N.. The Elizabethans (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) pages 7-8

Besides culture there was something else that kept the Irish vigorous enough to stave off their ruin – their warrior-like spirit and regular clashes among themselves. It wasn't uncommon to have news reaching the Pale of severe confrontations between the different Irish chieftains, this allowed them to be always attentive and practice their combat skills without any pause – "He should, therefore, never take his mind from this exercise of war, and in peacetime he must train himself more than in time of war. This can be done in two ways: first, through physical exercise; second, by study."<sup>26</sup> – being always warring and intriguing kept their minds sharp and their bodies fit.

There is, however, a strong reason for Scotland meaning more strategically than Ireland. Firstly the French were more encroached in Caledonia than any other Continentals were in Hibernia. The Auld Alliance had existed since 1295 and it was intentionally created to contain the English. Religion played a fundamental role to comprehend Scottish primacy; the north of England was the part of the country that was less convinced with the quit of Popery. This fact alarmed London a lot, since it was well known that the French-backed Scots could launch a campaign on the northern lands of the realm.

Ireland's position on the map was a good excuse to claim that Elizabeth's men were civilizing the peripheral, backwards and primitive Irish but everyone knew this was false. The need to construct a plausible narrative is not a malediction of the present, during the sixteenth century there was also the need to justify your policies. The English government had to consider international opinion and it excelled in denouncing its enemies for their faults and hiding its less humane deeds. It seemed that the Irish thorn would remain an unsolvable problem throughout Gloriana's reign, her servants would try to minimize the Hibernian ability to wage war efficiently in a project that included seduction, dismantlement and destruction. The name was not yet coined but the Irish were very comfortable in waging the type of war which came to be known as guerrilla warfare. Their tribal allegiances, mobile techniques, sabotage methods and furtive strikes did not permit the English to cut off the head of the snake, essentially because there existed no single head. This was both a blessing and a curse. A blessing thanks to its regenerating and malleable nature, a curse owing to its dispersed political body which stopped the forging of a real unified state.

---

<sup>26</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 51

## 2.2 - The French Puppets

It is true that England had to deal with the uncompromising Irish during all the Elizabethan Age but she was far more successful dealing with the northern neighbour, the battle for Scotland was won against a rival which seemed far more powerful – France. To comprehend how the Scottish case differed from the Irish one it is mandatory to have in mind three stages which made it be so: the Roman Empire, the Kingdom of Northumbria and the Norman conquest of England.

The first stage was during the Roman Empire, when the Romans held the land south of the Antonine Wall, this permitted the flow of civilization into those novel and distant lands unlike northern Scotland or Ireland. This northern province under the Antonine Wall was named Valentia and it contained within it the modern-day cities of Glasgow and Edinburgh.

The second stage was in the aftermath of the collapse of the Roman Empire and the subsequent colonization by the Germanic Tribes that conquered the former Roman lands, coming from the harsh and misty places beyond the Rhine. One of the Medieval Kingdoms that arose in northern Britain was the Kingdom of Northumbria, it went as far north as the old Roman subdivision of Valentia. From that chunk of land surged the language we today call Scots and the cultural, sociological and genetic affinity that England has with Southern Scotland that it does not have on the same scale with Ireland.<sup>27</sup>

The third stage was from the time of the Norman conquest of England in 1066 and the different ways in which the Normans continued their expansion – the approaches they had to Ireland and to Scotland were catastrophically different. Building on that already existing relation that had spurred from the ashes of Northumbria the Norman feudal lords ended up belonging to both England and Scotland, and had a soothing and comprehensive yoke around the northern neighbour because of the already mentioned similarities. The Irish weren't as lucky, they had to endure a painful and absolute yoke, they were seen by the Normans as inferiors to the Scots and this marked the complex

---

<sup>27</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. Discourses on Livy Book II (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 150

relations between those three nations throughout history. It is no wonder then, that England and Scotland are united today but Ireland opted out whenever it could.

When Elizabeth was declared queen of England "...the French king, was 'bestriding the realm, having one foot in Calais and the other in Scotland' "<sup>28</sup> this meant that for the time being France would be the number one enemy and it was imperative to disrupt French control over Scotland to create breathing room. Scotland had two factions which were very different from each other. One party wanted to remain within France's sphere of influence, liked Catholicism and hated the English, the other group desired to remove French clout from Scotland, embraced the new religious doctrines and saw England as a viable partner.

Gloriana knew the requirements she had to possess in order to triumph in a lawless and brutal world, that was why she was inclined to live according to the following advice:

"For there is no other way to guard yourself against flattery than by making men understand that by telling you the truth they will not injure you. But when anyone can tell you the truth, you lose respect. Therefore, a prudent prince should follow a third course, electing wise men for his state and giving only them permission to speak truthfully to him, and only on such matters as he asks them about and not on other subjects. But he should ask them about everything and should listen to their opinions, and afterwards he should deliberate by himself in his own way."<sup>29</sup>

Her advisors were swift in stating that she had to act, it was not wise to let the Lords of the Congregation fend for themselves against the *French Puppets* which would make sure that Scotland would eternally be an English foe. The queen's intelligence allowed her to see firsthand what she had suspected since her adolescent years, the crudeness and firmness that leading demands. She rapidly understood that in order to win you must be willing to play. If Scotland remained a fierce French ally it was clear that her kingdom could be smashed by a dual operation; the invasion of the northern parts of her realm by the French-backed Scots and the attack on the southern part of her domains,

---

<sup>28</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 9

<sup>29</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 81

coming straight from the hereditary contender. Elizabeth unleashed her imp, William Cecil, into the battlefield and made him tell the Scots that England would provide some aid for their just cause : "Whether it was luck, or Cecil 'making' England's luck on behalf of his queen and country, by April 1559, Scotland's Lords of the Congregation were already engaged in battle against the dowager Queen Mary of Guise's French troops."<sup>30</sup>

We are obliged to analyze France's geography to comprehend the primordial position which the country occupied and how her leaders extracted value from it. France was the center of gravity of many policies taken by the most capable European leaders, she was the main artery which connected all realms to each other. To the south-east you had the Italian states, to the south-west you had the Iberian states. They were culturally connected between each other through France, Southern France, Eastern Spain and Western Italy compose what we know as the Latin Arch. France was nurtured and inspired by all the knowledge she received from the two Peninsulas.

North of France you had Britain, ever since 1066 a lot of those lands were under the strong influence of French/Latin culture which reintroduced a lot of forgotten rules and wisdoms that had vanished after the fall of Roman Britain. English as a language suffered a massive input of vocabulary that approximated it from Latin tongues and distanced it from its Germanic roots. One of the most visible modifications is the pronunciation of the letter 'j' which is pronounced as in Portuguese or French in detriment of the Swedish or German pronunciation. Because of William the Conqueror's achieved project England commenced to see her connection with civilization through France, this is once again notorious within the language itself as the next example will show: the English used French names to mention the cities of the Holy Roman Empire in detriment of German ones, the two most vivid cases are the use of Aix-la-Chapelle instead of Aachen and Cologne instead of Köln.

East of the Kingdom of France lied the Empire, as it was usually known, late into British history whenever the word Empire was mentioned they were talking about the Holy Roman Empire and not their overseas colonies. The Empire had within it several

---

<sup>30</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 31

sovereign rulers and was never really a consolidated centralized state, it was the frontier zone between the cultural affinities of Western Europe. The western and southern parts of the Empire were connected with the before mentioned areas but its eastern and northern areas remained somewhat different.

The verdict is then clear, France had territorial contact with most of the other major players and this gave her force due to the fact that it was almost impossible to encircle her. On the battle for Scotland with England geography would however reduce French might and favour English resolution. Geographical continuity made England's task easier, since England was closer to Scotland it was far less complicated to provide goods and men to the Lords of the Congregation than it was for the French to do the same for their partners.

Geography alone does not win any war, but it definitely helps, Good Queen Bess saw fit to send William Winter to aid the Scottish resistance and he did not disappoint her. Winter was able to provide the necessary aid to the Scots, he was successful in repelling the French and providing his queen her first decisive victory: "Within a few weeks, in January 1560, it was a confident Winter who boldly sailed into the Firth of forth at Leith, cutting off the French army at Fife. The French troops almost immediately abandoned their weapons, and Winter captured two French galleys as prizes for himself, his men, and the glory of England."<sup>31</sup> Once again we are able to observe the crucial role played by religion, it is difficult to imagine the Scots falling into English amity and French enmity before the Reformation started. The reason for such statement is simple – proximity and distance – if doctrinally speaking England, Scotland and France were united the Scots would have opted for French tutelage. A state will always prefer to be dominated by a power that is far away rather than one which looms near, for in the former case it is almost impossible to be annexed while in the latter it is a real possibility. The wish to emancipate themselves from the rags of Rome made the Scots align themselves with the English in detriment of the French. Elizabeth would remember this event, it will be seen later on that she took notes and would make use of them in the future. Scotland was Elizabeth's greatest victory, it laid the foundations for what would come to be known as the United Kingdom of Great-Britain.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 35

*La Fortuna* seems to have been with the English on this first encounter, since William Winter was not destroyed by the elements when he engaged in his operation commissioned by Elizabeth; being a competent mariner certainly aided him but competence alone leads nowhere. The French had far more problems to deal with than the wavering of their grip on Scotland, they had relinquished their aspirations in Italy and it seemed like the Spaniards were unbeatable, holding too much land around France.

It isn't far-fetched to believe that France had already other plans when it fought with England over Scotland. The previous French moves showed us that they were keen on annexing new territories on their eastern border. Such had been the cases of the Three Bishoprics which were now a province of the Kingdom of France. France realized that it was easier to hold and assimilate territories which had geographical continuity with its current possessions. Metz, Toul and Verdun remain to this day part of France which proves that the eastward expansion was not a bad call, it is very wise even if it isn't very glorious to settle for the low-hanging fruit and keep it than to dream about everything and keep nothing.

It is not always easy to fight our human urges, that's why it is such an important feature on the policy of a prudent ruler: "Besides all this, human appetites are insatiable, for while we are endowed by nature with the power and will to desire everything, and by fortune with the ability to obtain little of it, the result is a continuous discontent in the minds of men and a dissatisfaction with the things they possess; this causes them to condemn present times, to praise the past, and to long for the future, even though they do so without any reasonable motive."<sup>32</sup> Machiavelli alerts us for the dire reality humans are embroiled in; their habitude to detest the immediacy and their glorification of the past (a process Machiavelli was not immune to). The reason why the future is desired is exactly the same why the past is deified, because we are allowed to choose the past we prefer and imagine the future we want. On the battle for Scotland the English knew that once in the past they owned half of France, this inspired them to win, that victory would be the beginning of the recreation of that brilliant past. A competent ruler is one which fathoms that he has to deal with the present.

---

<sup>32</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book II* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 151

## 2.3 - Exploiting the Franco-Habsburg rivalry

The Virgin Queen playfully teased her suitors and learned to align herself with the most important candidate according to the circumstances she faced. Her acute vision and wise advisors made her be the first English sovereign which would succeed in tricking the Spaniards and the French for her sole gain. The first that tried to secure an alliance with England were the Valois: "She did not have long to wait. It was Henry II who gave her the first breakthrough. Through an Italian merchant of considerable standing and knowledge of England, Guido Cavalcanti, Henry secretly suggested that if Elizabeth would marry someone 'of whose friendship France could feel assured' great amity between their realms would ensue. It was understood that the 'someone' was Henry's younger son, Henry, Duke of Anjou (later Henry III). Naturally, the queen made Philip II aware of the offer, thereby guaranteeing the King of Spain's protection against the Valois threats, either expressed or implied."<sup>33</sup> Letting Philip know the move made by the king of France was a way to be sure she would fall in Philip's good graces, if the French found about it she could always deny her involvement, blaming the problem on spies.

The king of Spain was very fond of Elizabeth too, he had known her when he was Mary's husband and more importantly – he sought a boreal partner to check French ambition. In the commencement of her reign Elizabeth opted for an approximation to Spain instead of France – this infuriated the French – such decision was taken considering mainly two realities: she was locked in a clash with the French over Scotland and France was geographically closer to Britain than Spain which in her eyes incremented the French threat and diminished the Spanish menace.

The French government was not happy with this hostility, such act made them demand Elizabeth's excommunication near His Holiness, but just like in the time of Gloriana's father the Papacy disregarded the French demand just like it had ignored the English one. The reason was still the same, Spanish influence over the Papacy. In the past it had been Charles V which frustrated Henry's wish, in the present his son was doing exactly the same but this time England was being protected and the sufferer was France. Elizabeth's cabinet was not composed of foolish men, everyone knew that their main

---

<sup>33</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 11

objective should be the poisoning of minds rather than an open conflict against a superior power, this made them use a very old tool – torture: "The assassin made his escape, but his accomplice, a fellow from Argos, was caught and put to torture by the Four Hundred."<sup>34</sup> One of the oldest written documents that survived into our days is Thucydides' report of the Peloponnesian War but we should not be naïve enough to think that before such event torture was not used. Torturing someone is indeed a very harsh method which distorts all moral or ethical obligations one might have – sadly this crescent rhetoric misses the point – in a constant struggle that will craft losers and victors, landmarks and defeats one cannot be chained to higher ideals because that can cost him his state.

The English queen knew her best chances of success would be reached if she was able to have the Valois and the Habsburgs consuming each other. They were fighting for rank one, two Catholic nations which could not overcome their differences and extirpate heresy together. It is required to dwell upon the limits Catholicism had and how those barriers allowed England to step into a position of greater importance within the geopolitical spectrum of great power politics of the sixteenth century.

Catholicism was unable to prevent the fierce opposition France kept posing to the number one power – Spain – this wasn't always the case since there were moments when it seemed like Catholic unity would overpower the rivalry between the two Latin giants. A prominent example was the backing Spain provided to Catholic Frenchmen having in mind the objective of exterminating all Protestant sects within the Kingdom of France. Catholicism ended up failing simply because it was too successful, being strongly implanted not only in the French realm or the Spanish Empire, it was also very present in Portugal and Austria. Although some insist on believing it so, this was not a religious conflict but a very terrestrial one; glory and dominance over your peers was something that had to be searched, if you fell into a state of apathy and tolerance your enemies could easily crush you. It was certainly true that Catholicism was not at all times a unifying element and that states sometimes opted for a more pragmatic approach to their day-to-day problems; but if this was surely the case we should also point out to the Catholic web that had been woven by an intelligent matriarch – Rome. Mary, Queen

---

<sup>34</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 462

of Scots, would be a rallying figure for many Englishmen that favoured the old ways. I will later on shed light on the importance of Catholicism as a destabilizing force in England, a menace that came from inside and not from any competitor states: "For a prince should have two fears: one internal, concerning his subjects; the other external, concerning foreign powers."<sup>35</sup>

Good Queen Bess was cognizant about those two fears, and she knew the different particularities that both carried. She knew she had to regard fear head-on, instead of pretending it wasn't there. Fear can be a useful professor or a senseless demon, depending on how we decide to deal with it – Elizabeth feared both internal dissenters as she did outsiders because she analyzed the experiences felt by others: "The rest, which are Appetites of particular things, proceed from Experience, and triall of their effects upon themselves, or other men. For of things wee know not at all, or believe not to be, we can have no further Desire, than to tast and try. But Aversion wee have for things, not onely which we know have hurt us; but also that we do not know whether they will hurt us, or not."<sup>36</sup>

Her aversion to events that had brought about the downfall of others made her be always alert of the perils that surrounded her. The battle between Spain and France wasn't limited by the European continent, before the English started to be a real trouble to the Portuguese and the Spaniards the French were already ravaging, pillaging and damaging territories that belonged – under the Papal Bull – to the two Iberian crowns.

Mary Stuart would be the catalyzer of the *Rising of the North* in England against Elizabeth's rule, Mary was in no way less alluring than Elizabeth, she was refined, educated and very practical but fortune didn't favour her. Her first husband, Francis II, gave her the possibility to be queen consort of France, from 1559 to 1560 but the first setback she would endure rapidly took shape – Francis died. Mary descended from a very influent French family – Guise – her mother was the one in charge of Scotland taking care of French interests there. When the king died many from her inner circle suggested to Catherine de Médicis that she should marry the next king, Charles IX.

---

<sup>35</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 63

<sup>36</sup> Hobbes, Thomas. *The Leviathan* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 19

Catherine remained unconvinced, it was probably her that decided to give less importance to the Scottish alliance, seeing it as a permanent drain of resources without proper advantages. Catherine also wanted to reduce the degree of influence the Guise family had, they were becoming too important and she saw this as a real menace to the power of the French state.

The queen of Scots did not let such blow decimate her projects and when she realized that the French were not granting her the honour and aid she required she swiftly moved back to her homeland. Arriving there in 1561. She went on to marry Henry Stuart (Lord Darnley) which would provide her a son that would be James VI of Scotland and James I of England.

But it was during her last marriage that she would provoke a serious problem to the English crown. The man she contracted matrimony with was James Hepburn, 4<sup>th</sup> Earl of Bothwell, during her final wedlock she was hunted out of the country by Protestant Scots and sought refuge in northern England. Her stay in England would be confined to proper houses which had Elizabethan guards and vigilant personnel to control her. Mary's presence in English soil inspired the *Rising of the North* essentially because these Catholic sympathizers saw her as a fantastic alternative to Elizabeth; they wanted to restore Catholicism in England and Mary was a marvellous choice to be their new leader.

This rebellion allows us to grasp how internal and external enemies can be intertwined and how dealing with one group infuses you with energy and knowledge to deal with the other. The support the English state provided to the Lords of the Congregation had opened a possibility which had been unknown to England prior to Gloriana's reign. Having a friendly faction in Scotland was one of the masterstrokes of Elizabeth's government, the possibilities were endless, Scotland didn't have to be an enemy. This reveals the obstinate character of Elizabethan policies – they were meticulous, informed and ambitious. Ambition mustn't be wild and uncontrolled – that sort of ambition will surely cause more damage than joy. The queen of England had an ambition which was reasonable, she knew how to remove idyllic objectives and focus on those which were feasible. Mary Stuart's failure cannot obviously be fully blamed on fortune, she was

caught between a remarkably important shifting phase within the geopolitical history of the British Isles. When she abandoned France it was probably a good idea to go back to Scotland, to stir the spirits of her kin, but England was pursuing a different type of policy towards the Scots – it was far more inclusive than what Mary had been expecting, this rendered more difficult the completion of her original plan. One is obliged to wonder whether a visit to Spain wouldn't have been a better option, all in all Spain could perhaps be interested in taking the role of France – sponsoring and protecting her.

When Elizabeth successfully abolished the rebellion which had been launched by the Earl of Northumberland and the Earl of Westmoreland she came to the following conclusion: toleration towards Catholics would commence to decrease, she could not afford that type of dissent inside her state. Her ability to vanquish internal enemies was grander than her strength to deal with foreign powers. It was necessary that she would never permit the link between external and internal foes, if this occurred her chances of victory would be massively impaired. This was probably why increased brutality was more cherished as time wore on, but there was another key factor:

"Five months after the Catholic-inspired Northern Rising failed, Pope Pius V at last took measures that had been mooted on the queen's accession – he published the *Regnans in excelsis*, excommunicating England's heretic queen on February 25, 1570. The papal bull radiated from Rome like wildfire and was published throughout Europe. Alba ensured that it was published in the Netherlands in March, especially in the ports for all who dealt with England to see."<sup>37</sup>

The Vicar of Christ had passed his judgement – *Iacta alea est* – the Rubicon had been breached and now there was absolutely no chance of stopping the intensification of the conflict between Elizabeth and Catholicism. The débâcle of the Popish religion was what followed, essentially because Nationalism burned brighter and more ardently in the hearts of nominal Catholics which were mostly loyal to their Nation-States.

---

<sup>37</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 145

## 2.4 - The Dutch Question

The Dutch Question is in no way less interesting than The Eastern Question or The German Question and it can be seen as a crossing between the other two. It involved a lot of uprisings and the reestablishment of a preceding order like the former and a territorial dispute like the latter. Considering all this it is obligatory to learn why during Elizabeth's reign the Low Countries were no longer part of the Holy Roman Empire like they had been in the beginning of the XVI century. Philip's father had decided that from the four dynastic lines he had inherited only one would pass to his brother Ferdinand – the Austrian branch. The other three – Castile, Aragon and Burgundy – would all go to his progeny. This posed a problem regarding the Burgundian circle because theoretically he should have passed it also to his brother, this circle was inside the border of the Holy Roman Empire so Charles had to separate it from it; this was very well received by all the inhabitants, it was some sort of emancipation to break free from the Empire's chains. He decided this having one enemy in mind – France. He knew that the French were powerful and required a constant check on their eastern border or they could produce a victorious offensive. He analyzed correctly that Spain would be more preoccupied with French expansionism than the Austrians and she would have more meanings to pay to stall it regarding the colonial revenue.

Philip II of Spain was profoundly attached to his Hispanic culture, considering it to be the proper heir to Roman culture – the French thought otherwise – this intransigency made him enter in direct conflict with the Low Countries which were unsatisfied with Latin cultural sway over their dominions. Benton Rain Patterson clarifies us with an incisive remark: "In the Netherlanders' mind, the ruler owed the people something; they held him accountable for their welfare. Philip rejected such ideas. In his view the ruler was meant to rule, and the people were meant to be ruled. That was what he was used to. Charles, born in the Netherlands, had struggled to understand and accommodate the independent spirit of the people there; Philip, a son of Spain, rejected it altogether."<sup>38</sup>

The Netherlands had been attracted by one of the new religious doctrines, Calvinism just like the Scots. Heresy was spreading throughout northern Europe like a scourge, for

---

<sup>38</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 36

the Protestants it was a burning hope, for the Catholics it was the flame of sorrow. The king of Spain could not be laxist, if he didn't extirpate heresy it would continue to grow until it was impossible to dismember. Because of it he chose a policy which would persecute and trouble his northern subjects. We ought to know why the Low Countries were so important for Spanish primacy and Catholic resistance – the overlap of Catholic and Spanish agendas often lead us to think they were one single programme but it was not so. The great-grandson of Isabel the Catholic was obligated to focus on three fronts, this was well known by the English and they were able to exploit Spain's compromise to several causes to penetrate at ease in some of them against the Spaniards. This occurred most notably in the support they made accessible to the Dutch. It is of the utmost importance to compare the case of Elizabeth's realm and Philip's empire. Islam, the Low Countries and France composed the three blades of the trident Spain had to deal with. England's position was different, having less power and land to control, it made its mission far more doable, for it is well known that the larger territory you have the harder it is to govern because more problems spawn, time is often against you and the scope of your action must be bigger and stretchable. We are then faced with a perfect dichotomy – the vastness of your state increases your prestige and strength but equally undermines them, only a prudent ruler can strike a balance between size and competence. Knowledge should always be preferred to land because with the former you will enhance your governing capabilities and with the latter your apparent force grows but your effectual one might diminish.

Elizabeth's privy council was divided since the start on how to deal with the Protestants in Holland. There were two main conceptions in all state organisms and the country in general, the first saw no distinction between the fight England could have with Catholic states any different than they saw the war over Holland, this led them to assume that any Protestant cause should have their backing. The second was a more laic approach, it failed to see a supposed connection between all the Protestants as if they were locked in a divine battle against Catholics. Both strains of thought saw with good eyes an intervention in the Netherlands (for different reasons) so this was done. Before Anglo-Spanish relations soured for good Gloriana had had the tact to help the rebels against Spanish rule in the Netherlands with a lot of discretion, she didn't want to infuriate the most powerful empire in the world. The geopolitical situation of the second half of the sixteenth century in Europe was so complex that it would put to shame the modern

configuration of the Middle East. In order to grasp the totality of the issues on the board concerning the Dutch Question it is required to measure the friction England had with the two Catholic behemoths on that specific area.

Spain needed the Low Countries mainly because of two reasons: money and strategy. Centralization meant that the Spanish ran treasury would extract more and more cash and would consequently reduce the power of the aristocrats which would then gradually relinquish political influence. Strategy allows us the ability to see that even if the Low Countries were less important than Milan they were nevertheless a good defense against many threats. For the most pious it was a vanguard outpost to fight heresy, for political reasons it was a good way to corset France, which had its own plans for the area. France dreamt about controlling all areas on the left bank of the Rhine which had once belonged to the Romans. This would extend French clout massively, gaining control of all those port cities and it would limit Spain to southern zones. The advantage was given by geography to the Kingdom of France, for it could further its cause through French which was the language used by the Low Countries for most of its history to deal with the outside world and closeness made sure the travels were swifter than those needed to be made by Philip's armies. England was in a complicated position, if Spain was shut off from the Low Countries it meant that France would in principle get stronger and bolder. If Spain managed to hold her ground and suppress the Protestants her eyes could be set on the prize beyond the sea. Spain and France were too Catholic to be trusted so England would help the underdog, the infamous Sea Beggars which would pester all her foes but in 1566 the aggressive methods of the Calvinists unleashed a firm response from the king of Spain, and this would destabilize deeper the already volatile status:

"The previous year he had loosed the finest commander of any army in Europe on the Flemings – Don Fernando Álvarez de Toledo, Duke of Alba. Alba had been appointed as general governor of the Low Countries in retaliation to the Flemings' rebellion, called the Iconoclastic Fury."<sup>39</sup>

Anglo-Spanish relations had had a decent commencement but as the years went by Elizabeth's seamen had been prowling and disturbing lands that didn't belong to them –

---

<sup>39</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 131

the Spanish Main. After the Pope's excommunication in 1570 they would go from bad to worse, as Papal and Spanish causes kept overlapping England incremented her aid to all those that provided a bulwark between her territories and Spain. Alba's efficiency and cruelty scared not only the Virgin Queen but every monarch in Europe other than his own.

The English monarch knew that betting on the Calvinist rebels wasn't a good decision but the least bad she could take:

"Nor should any state ever believe that it can always choose safe courses of action. On the contrary, it should recognize that they will all be risky, for we find this to be in the order of things: that whenever we try to avoid one disadvantage, we run into another. Prudence consists in knowing how to recognize the nature of disadvantages, and how to choose the least sorry one as good."<sup>40</sup>

England was able to join Philip's enemies in the Low Countries concerning another element that is a crucial part of any dispute – Propaganda. Winning always demands more from you than the pure military skill and cunning, it asks for inspiration and convincing arguments considering that you are on the side which is correct. It is no wonder then that the people must be manipulated by strong messages and defiant roars. Alba's zero tolerance policy gave his opposition a very viable element on the war of words; they were able to depict Philip's armies as the armies of Hell. Philip himself was associated with the Antichrist. This inspired the common folk, all peasants which were fascinated by Calvinism had the confirmation of their truth in opposing the Popish religion which promoted the contrary of what was desirable by God. Since the XV century with the important invention of a practical and movable printing press (Guttenberg is credited for this) it was far easier to disseminate ideas and also perspectives which were outside of the norm – similar to the internet in the XXI century – so it was easier to indoctrinate the minds of those which were less acquainted with the intellectual realm. During the Elizabethan Age the government of England counted with efficient spin doctors, their job was to maintain the immaculate image of the Virgin Queen while exacerbating the horrors of enemy institutions such as the Spanish

---

<sup>40</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 78

Inquisition. Books, pamphlets and songs illustrated that England represented liberty and Spain mirrored bondage, a duel between good and evil: "Another way, common by Milton's time, was to consider evil as a living, active force, deliberately trying to subvert God and tempt man. Evil acquired the personality of Satan, and the serpent in Genesis was therefore really Satan in disguise, although there was no basis in Genesis for this notion. In a number of ancient civilizations, serpents have signified evil, but also fertility."<sup>41</sup>

National identity is more often than not forged in the crucible of war hence the Hispanic Kingdoms which derived from the Kingdom of Asturias were forged in their resistance against Islam; likewise the Seventeen Provinces would hatch their own political apparition resisting French or Spanish cultural sway over their possessions. It is explicit that in the Protestant movement of Holland and the Holy Roman Empire there was an historical precedent, just as their Germanic ancestors had once held their ground against Roman intromission so were they now stopping Roman daughters from corrupting their ways of life. The Germanic Tribes had had a different conception of freedom from those of the Romans, Greeks or Persians, the political face of Protestantism was a cry of desperation against what they saw as Mediterranean features. The surge of Protestantism opened the possibility to unite those who were usually divided, this is explained by this notion which Machiavelli captured brilliantly: "The wounds and all the other evils that men inflict upon themselves voluntarily are far less painful than those which are inflicted upon them by others."<sup>42</sup>

The conflict raging in the Low Countries tore Europe apart, it contained religious intolerance, naval and terrain battles, displacements and tragic consequences. Elizabeth Tudor was for now protected by the sea, she had no land troops to vanquish French or Spanish military excellence. It was then necessary to bet on those which could protect her Nation. Their victims called them pirates, rovers and criminals, their ilk named them merchant adventurers, traders and heroes. But the Netherlands were near, they weren't the New World or Sicily, if the rebels fell one of the leaks draining Spanish funds could be fixed and this sounded the alarm in London.

---

<sup>41</sup> Freedman, Lawrence. *Strategy: A History* (Oxford University Press, USA; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed., 2013) page 56

<sup>42</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book I* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 96

## 3 - Audacity

### 3.1 - Embracing the World

It is in the order of things that when a cancer starts to metastasize and is then present in more than one organ you can do little to reverse the process. English corsairs were able to spread through the Spanish organism in an appalling and rapid manner. Since the beginning of Elizabeth's reign it is clear that were the maritime adventures beyond Europe that increased the reputation of England. It is required of me to explain why the English mariners were more successful than their French counterparts but before I do so it is also important to state the ground controlled by Lisbon and Seville.

The Portuguese Empire started with the conquest of Ceuta in 1415, commencing Modernity, a period that would be characterized by the European colonial empires. The western part of the Portuguese Empire was a triangular operation between Portugal, Brazil and Western Africa (most notably Angola) and its command center was Lisbon. The eastern part of the Portuguese Empire comprised all the areas bathed by the Indic Ocean, from Mozambique to Macau – its capital was Goa and its dependencies were under the administration of the *Estado da Índia*.

The Spanish Empire started with the arrival at America of Christopher Columbus in 1492 during the reign of the Catholic Monarchs, that same year had seen the reconquest of Granada – the last Muslim stronghold in the Iberian Peninsula. The Spanish Empire was the first empire that managed to be both a land and a maritime empire of considerable size at the same time. Unlike the Portuguese lands the Spaniards were confined to a more strict area, they held control over all the lands in the Americas – besides the Brazilian territories – from modern day Argentina in the south to modern day meridional USA in the north. There was, however, an archipelago beyond the Pacific Ocean that was under Spanish power too, the Philippines. The Spice Islands had been renounced during the reign of Charles V, if you sailed beyond the Philippines you were entering Portuguese territory and the Spaniards were interested in maintaining a good relation with their neighbour so they behaved properly.

If you want to succeed your words must be backed by power, if you don't have military strength to support your righteous stance and just claim you will be ridiculed and effortlessly removed from the grand decision making process:

"So keep this discussion practical, within the limits of what we both really think. You know as well as we do that when we are talking on the human plane questions of justice only arise when there is equal power to compel: in terms of practicality the dominant exact what they can and the weak concede what they must."<sup>43</sup>

Elizabeth knew the crude reality she faced, her decisions spelled out her approach – imitate the French. Legend has it that when the Treaty of Tordesillas was produced Francis I of France demanded to see Adam's clause that excluded him from colonizing areas outside Europe. The reason why the French were the first and the loudest to attack such treaty was deeply connected with their military might, without it they would have remained silent like many others. We are obliged to analyze the geographical conundrum which increased England's chance of success and undermined that of the French. Since the Kingdom of France was the second largest power in Europe it had to deal with many problems at once while England remained more protected due to her peripheral position. A prudent ruler like Gloriana was aware of this, she had a freer ability to roam compared with the King of France because he was deeply entangled in continental affairs – religious problems, territorial disputes and Spanish influence along his border. The centralization and state competence that England was engulfed in during Elizabeth's epoch allowed her to increment her defenses in a way that had been unseen until then. The English Channel that had once been a simple barrier to pass such as did Celts, Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans was now proving to be a more virulent obstacle to overcome. It was during Good Queen Bess' rule that England would become more intimate with the sea than ever before, a competent leader always seeks to reduce his perils with the knowledge and means that he has, English merchant adventurers had a lot to thank their government for its commitment to their cause. Continental Europeans didn't have the same luck, it was always necessary to reach a consensus between land and sea power, the French had to divide their financing meticulously and rationally between those two fields – the English had not, the sea would suffice.

---

<sup>43</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 302

Postmodern liberals tend to believe that trade is a very fierce enemy of war and don't see that war and trade are closely knit, many times to open trade you need to intimidate or decimate. Trade also gives birth to conflict due to the fact that different companies, states or interest groups will enter in combat for products and markets. The queen of England knew that her seamen were not engaging in lawful procedures most of the time, she knew that to be able to trade you had to descend into criminality – this was a risk she was willing to take.

Elizabeth was blessed with ingenious men which were hungry for adventure, many of them hated the Pope and his cronies and were serious fighters against the spread of Catholicism. Others were not so preoccupied with religious practices but longed for fame and wealth. One of those men was John Hawkins, later rewarded with the title 'Sir' for his deeds. Hawkins' voyages between 1560 and 1570 focused on disrupting Portuguese Africa and the Spanish Americas, he was fruitful and was able to expose the fragilities which both Iberian Crowns had regarding their colonies. The structures that existed were not very complex and had some flaws that had been exploited by the French and were about to endure the same fate by Hawkins' men. England had to face a stark choice and she decided to gamble: "Envy of the luxury trades, so long monopolized by the Spaniards and the Portuguese, was the strongest motive for the enterprise. But it was its component backers – from the common seaman to the lord high admiral and City merchants – that set the blueprint for the future of English maritime expansion. The distinction among England's sea dogs, her merchants, and her rulers would become more and more blurred as the Elizabethan age progressed, with maritime exploits and successes becoming the most certain way of rising quickly in society and in wealth."<sup>44</sup> The jump into the unknown certainly felt more reassuring since it was a collective task in which different members of the social order all had a role to play.

Hawkins' plan was straightforward, he wanted to make fast money and frustrate his queen's enemies. Strategy always made the English worry more about the Spaniards than the Portuguese, for it was Spain that had France corseted and a very strong presence in the Low Countries. Hawkins' programme consisted in two phases: the first

---

<sup>44</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 46

was a trip to Portuguese outposts in West Africa where he would capture negroes to sell in the Caribbean to the Spaniards. The second part of his programme was about conducting the trade and getting the most out of it; meaning he would try to extract as much value as he could from his slave cargo. Although this was supposed to be a commercial venture he did not stop his crew from damaging enemy territories, this was a process where violence and trade coalesced into a single activity – his queen was delighted with such method because she would profit from it economically and ultimately strategically by dampening her enemies capability to wage war. What made John Hawkins a proper military leader was his flexibility which allowed him to mix his bravery with his awareness:

"There are persons who possess the keenest perception for the most difficult problems, who are also not fearful of responsibility, and yet in cases of difficulty cannot come to a resolution. Their courage and their sagacity operate independently of each other, do not give each other a hand, and on that account do not produce resolution as a result."<sup>45</sup>

Clausewitz rightly reminds us that in order to prevail having the necessary characteristics isn't enough, you must contain the required adaptability to respond at a given moment in time. A wise prince must always try to extract the best out of his men, he should not assume that just because someone is good within a paradigm he is ready for another, thus choosing your servants' role is as important as choosing the servants themselves. This keeps happening down the line, when a prince delegates to his henchmen also these must be savvy and observe the skills in which their men excel. Since men have different experiences in their lives and are attracted by different things one must recognize such things and use them to shock, entice or inspire his inferiors. In any combat, those with the highest responsibilities must be able to infer what is going on faster and less opaquely than the rest, for it is in them that lies the power to give orders. When you realize that your superior does not know what he is doing – in any trade of life – you grow tired of his orders and commence to despise him, in the military trade this is a very serious matter due to the constant perception that death might only be some seconds away. On contrary if you feel overwhelmed and amazed with your captain this will permit the relaxation of your body and the soothing of your mind,

---

<sup>45</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 30

granting you a fake but important sense of security so you will perform less nervously and more graciously. A competent overseer is one who isn't taken in by the cyclone of the fog of war: "Now, if it is to get safely through this perpetual conflict with the unexpected, two qualities are indispensable: in the first place an intellect which, even in the midst of this intense obscurity, is not without some traces of inner light, which lead to the truth, and then the courage to follow this faint light. The first is figuratively expressed by the French phrase *coup d'oeil*. The other is resolution."<sup>46</sup>

It might be odd at first sight but in order to alleviate one place (Holland) you more often than not have to pressure far away from the target (the West Indies) which will thenceforth provoke a chain reaction which will arrive at the wished destination. This was what Elizabeth asked of Hawkins, and just like William Winter before him he did not fail. During the 1560s England greatly benefitted from oversea missions but there was another important addition to her majesty's realm – Dutch subsistence migrants. These refugees were eager to escape Spanish rule and England absorbed and assimilated some of them. They brought two techniques which ameliorated the conditions of life in England – avant-garde cloth-making and drainage procedures. The former made English cloth industry explode in quantity and efficiency, the latter created more arable lands and consequently more nourishment and dividends.

England's accomplishments during this decade cannot be credited solely to her gentlemen since what filled Philip's nightmares was not such much the infidel Gloriana but the troubling relentlessness of the Ottoman Empire – a strike is always more problematic when it picks not only the right lieu but also the right timing. In the European courts everyone opined about English depredations, some considered them suicidal and others crossed their fingers for more, knowing how they annoyed the hegemon. By 1570 the presence and importance of London around Guinea and the Caribbean was a *fait accompli* and this irritated the Portuguese and infuriated the Spaniards. England had found the reputation her queen mercilessly sought and now all the other players were noting the *Rise of the Albion*. It had struck far enough to cause astonishment but close enough from home not to overextend – simply because the Guinea is not the Far East and the Caribbean is not the Persic Gulf.

---

<sup>46</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 29

## 3.2 - Ridolfi, Lepanto and Saint Bartholomew

Roberto di Ridolfi was a man of fiber and convictions, he was the central piece of the plot to murder Elizabeth which carried his name – Ridolfi plot. Since he was a preeminent banker his trade allowed him to travel Europe and reunite support without causing too much stir. His plan was meant to produce the following result: the trade of Elizabeth for Mary, Queen of Scots, and the latter would marry Lord Norfolk which was a very titled and affluent nobleman. England would then reverse to Catholicism. This case shows us the necessity to work with men that can be trusted; without loyalty all plans die, just like when babies succumb inside their mother's womb, before their birth. If you were to disdain the importance of loyalty all your objectives would be unreachable because it is loyalty that guarantees the safeguard of your activity and this leads us to the key role played by secrecy. A competent executioner must never, under any circumstance, disclose the true purpose he pursues:

"In this, one clearly recognizes how much stupidity and how little prudence there is in asking for something and later declaring: 'I want to do such and such evil deed with this', for one must not reveal one's intentions, but instead should attempt to obtain what one wants by any means possible. For it is enough to ask somebody for his weapons without saying, 'I want to kill you with them', because when you have his weapons in hand, you can then satisfy your desire."<sup>47</sup>

You should also not shy away from extreme methods when everything else isn't working – a stash of goods (or a satchel with gold) buys a man's silence for a time, a bullet through his skull (or a glaive through his heart) buys it forever. To avoid such cruelties you should always try to cut deals with those that follow your vision of the world since they will gladly be martyrs for one's cause without leaking information to the enemy. It might have been true that Ridolfi himself was infallible and irreproachable but his partners did not mirror his conduct, they neglected the role secrecy has to play in any achieved victory. What made the plot collapse was the loathsome habit which many men possess, that of bragging. Bragging after the accomplishment is assured is one thing while bragging while the result hasn't been reached is another. It is advisable that

---

<sup>47</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. Discourses on Livy Book I (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 115

you brag when the mission was successfully carried out but it is damaging that you do so before, for you betray your cause – providing the enemy with intelligence that can be fatal for your progress. A common mistake among rookie plotters is the idea that quantity might supersede quality. It is advisable that you opt for a minor number of accomplices instead of a big one, for the wider your network is the greater your chances of failure are. Boasting and ingenuity made Ridolfi's dream impossible. England's secret services were also competent and decisive, a struggle is always composed of at least two sides, the English one knew the effectiveness of double agents.

Elizabeth had survived, her state had been able to reduce her enemies and learned more about how they planned and acted. The next two events would nevertheless be prejudicial for English interests.

The Battle of Lepanto was fought between the Holy League and the Ottoman Empire in 1571 during the month of October. This battle marked the beginning of the end of the House of Osman which would be removed from power in 1922 in the aftermath of World War One. Besides Venice all the other participants were either directly or indirectly under the power of Philip II of Spain. This confrontation occurred due to the operation that snatched Cyprus from Venice and made it property of Selim II. Selim was the son of Suleiman the Magnificent so he had to endure a lot of unfair comparisons with his father – it was expected that the new sultan annexed new territories to his domains. The doge was asked to relinquish control over Cyprus but this didn't happen; consequently the Ottomans started conquering the island. Only Famagusta resisted for long, a lot of the Venetians subjects in Cyprus practiced the Orthodox faith, they despised the Catholics just as much as they did the followers of Islam so this gave way to a fairly easy takeover by the Turks. The Cypriots were tired of Venetian abrasiveness and were so desperate that thought about trying life under the sultan. We cannot understand Lepanto without focusing on what the king of Spain, the doge of Venice and the sultan desired and how Good Queen Bess observed the situation. The first wanted to stop the sultan's impetus towards the West but not at any cost, if you study the Mediterranean map you will notice that it can be roughly divided in two parts – the first goes from the strait of Gibraltar to Sicily (septentrional) and the second from Tunisia to the Levant (meridional). Philip wanted to guarantee the safety of

the septentrional part without having much interest in the meridional one. He was educated and smart enough to know that the meridional part had been lost a long time ago when the sect of Islam sprouted from the desert and swallowed the Byzantine fiefs. Alvise wanted to weaken the Turkish grip around the Venetian state, the singular relation between Venice and the Ottoman Empire meant that what the Venetians were actually fighting for (although they would never admit it) was how many orders the sultan would dictate to them – they were completely unable to survive without the Ottoman Empire, most of their business relied on it. Their project was one of bargaining rather than one of liberation. Selim II had the boldest project of the three, his mission was that of expanding the Caliphate, Cyprus was a tiny step along an extensive march, that of subjugating all the world to Islam – the one true faith. England rooted for a Spanish defeat, whatever reduced Spanish force was welcome, even if the price to pay was the Muslim conquest of Europe.

After the battle the Cross had obliterated the Crescent – for the time being Europe would remain shielded from Islam: "After four to five hours, the Battle of Lepanto came to an end, the air filled with the smoke of artillery and burning hulks, the sea thick with wreckage and corpses. The Holy League's victory was so overwhelming that not more than 40 of the 250 Turkish galleys managed to escape. The rest were either sunk or captured. The Turks also lost an estimated thirty thousand men killed and eight thousand taken prisoner. They also lost the thousands of Christian galley slaves who were restored to freedom, many of whom had burst their fetters to join the fight against their Moslem captors. The Holy League lost an estimated eight thousand killed and sixteen thousand wounded."<sup>48</sup> The Porte was shattered when the news reached the capital, the Turks would never recover from this blow, their maritime power would never threaten Europe again. In spite of this their land power remained intact being only convincingly put to rest in 1683 – the second round at Vienna.

The Ottoman defeat caused almost as much distress in London as it did in Constantinople, Elizabeth's government could not believe the news that rapidly spread throughout Europe – the Turk's invincibility was broken – the Janissaries had been unable to beat the Spanish *Tercios*. Things were about to get even worse, not long after

---

<sup>48</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 196

Lepanto, in 1572, a massacre took place in Paris. The Massacre of Saint Bartholomew was another event which was nefarious for Elizabethan aims. After John's success in the Mediterranean theater Elizabeth had been counting more and more on the Huguenot faction in France to check Spanish ambition; the Parisian carnage commanded by Catherine de Médicis greatly decreased the Huguenot stance and thus England's.

France's fate hung in the balance as the Huguenots implanted their seeds in fertile ground but Catherine wasn't going to allow Catholicism to lose to Protestantism nor tolerate inner divisions which stopped France from dominating the international stage. Her message was transparent and mortal, she demanded total annihilation. Charles IX was a mere puppet, he was effeminate and dull – Catherine de Médicis and Elizabeth Tudor were far more manly than him: "In the first blood orgy on St Bartholomew's Day, conservatively over two thousand Huguenots were slain. It was the first such massacre of Christians against Christians. Its suddenness, viciousness, and ferocity stunned all who witnessed it and all who heard about it."<sup>49</sup> The shock of the aforementioned event wasn't only felt in London but wherever Protestantism had taken root and the operation didn't cease in Paris, it operated in many other important locations like Bordeaux, Rouen, Lyon or Toulouse. To fully grasp the ecclesiastical stake on the struggle one has to dissociate himself from the current connotation of Christianity as a single column composed of several doctrines. In the XVI century Eastern Orthodoxy despised Roman Catholicism as a false faith just like Islam. Rome acted likewise *vis-à-vis* Constantinople or Moscow. When Luther kicked-off the Protestant Reformation Catholics had seen it as an abandonment of the true faith by their once righteous brothers. This evokes the complexity religion is bound to brew, it can be a source of peace and harmony but also pain and mayhem.

Considering Lepanto and Saint Bartholomew's massacre England stood in a dire position. Spain would be less worried with Mediterranean disputes and would focus more in Holland, France had rendered the Huguenots feeble and terrorized. The queen of England had allied herself with the Huguenot team since she saw its existence as a double threat to her foes. They would disrupt France internally and harass the Spaniards along Flanders. The burden of protecting English interests in the Low Countries had

---

<sup>49</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 161

fallen to Elizabethan resources, she could no longer count on the enemies of her enemies to wage her wars. Gloriana's vulpine tricks were running out, from the commencement of the 70s she started preparing her lions for whatever fortune would lash her way.

Elizabethan society was however satisfied with a constant state of war for it can be a very lucrative business: "Then the Athenians had suffered the further defeat at Amphipolis and both Cleon and Brasidas had been killed, the two men on either side who were most opposed to the peace – Brasidas because the war was bringing him success and reputation, and Cleon because he knew that in peacetime his own mischief would be more evident and his denigration of others less credible."<sup>50</sup> War can be beneficial for those that seek to climb the social ladder but also for those which are already encroached on the system. The former have a bold and honorable path to success which would be closed during peace; for them war was the sole possibility to improve their lives and those of their families, war provides fast social mobility like no other trade can. The latter can more comfortably keep their shady and sleazy deals stealth and since war times require special measures they can adopt stronger punishments and foul stances which wouldn't be tolerated under peace. A connoisseur of social dynamics is aware that most men can be perverted by money, basically because then they achieve their objectives – Women, titles, estates, social recognition, stability. Yet war is the battlefield *par excellence* for those eldritch fellows that can't be tamed by materialism which are the most dangerous and the most respectable – immortality is what they seek.

The three cases exposed allude to how a direct victory can rapidly be forgotten with calamitous indirect failures. There is often no time to engage in celebrations, the loose standards can swiftly engender lethal effects. The English notables would continue to evaluate the situation, they tried to comprehend how England could continue hidden behind her mask while at the same time sapping as much as she could the missions undertaken by other crowns. The Virgin Queen's destiny would remain cloudy and she would keep sending mixed signals to everyone, even to herself.

---

<sup>50</sup> Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 264

### 3.3 - Behind Enemy Lines

The battle of San Juan de Ulúa in modern day Vera Cruz, Mexico signaled a stagnation on Hawkins' reputation and a steady increase on Drake's. Such confront occurred in 1568 and marked the last great voyage led by John Hawkins which barely escaped the massacre suffered by the Englishmen. Drake also managed to escape his death but besides the ship he commanded and that commanded by Hawkins all the others were either captured or sunk. Spanish duplicity had been felt by the English, Philip's men were tired of falling prey to pirates and so procrastinated their attack no longer; in order to succeed they made a truce with the English party and when reinforcements arrived they struck without any resent. We are obliged to fathom why Drake and Hawkins were the most apt and managed to overcome the trap laid by the Spaniards. The higher your position is the safer you will be – those that inhabit the highest echelons of any profession use their power to protect their interests and shield their organism from diverse plans to damage it. The two English mariners did exactly this, Hawkins being the leader of the expedition had a lot of control over his troops and when he comprehended that he had fallen into a ruse he positioned his men in an optimal way for his survival. Drake was related to him and he benefitted from this connection which permitted him to acquire an advantage among other corsairs for it is well known the emotional ties between those of the same family and how this can influence their dealings with outsiders.

This event augmented Drake's hatred for the Spaniards which had been treacherous and frigid; it is from this moment on that Drake commences to realize how important these voyages were since they not only provided riches but also just retribution against a tyrannic and fanatic king. Drake's nascent political mindset was constructed on this battle, he evolved from a merchant adventurer with desires of grandeur to a political individual with long term projects. When he arrived in England in 1569 Elizabeth was growing more dependent on him to finance her crown and to increment her reputation, she knew that her fate was becoming more and more directly proportional to the success achieved by her seamen, it was not time to cower away from what she had already started. Now we must point out how raids in the West Indies proved to be a fundamental factor in Gloriana's delicate position and more importantly how she was able to master

communication and geography: "NOTHING makes a prince more esteemed than great undertakings and showing himself to be extraordinary. In our own times we have Ferdinand of Aragon, the present King of Spain. This man can be called almost a new prince, since from being a weak ruler, through fame and glory he became the first king of Christendom."<sup>51</sup> Elizabeth Tudor could not support great adventures in Europe as said continent disposed of a grand solidity and centenary institutions which could not be seriously challenged. This made her focus on the New World, a lieu which was novel and possessed very fragile structures which could be penetrated at ease. She knew how and where to create a grave laceration and then infect it beyond repair. Distance allowed her to cloak and seize two different ideas; one dissociated itself from the criminal endeavours performed with her consent and the other fed upon such missions to increase her strength and impertinence – if a process embraces duality it can certainly promote an undeniable efflorescence.

When Drake returned to the Spanish Main he had improved his approach and refined his conduct – practice and experience had helped him mature – I say so because of his new acquired tact, that of gathering information: "By the word 'information' we denote all the knowledge which we have of the enemy and his country; therefore, in fact, the foundation of all our ideas and actions. Let us just consider the nature of this foundation, its want of trustworthiness, its changefulness, and we shall soon feel what a dangerous edifice War is, how easily it may fall to pieces and bury us in its ruins. For although it is a maxim in all books that we should trust only certain information, that we must be always suspicious, that is only a miserable book comfort, belonging to that description of knowledge in which writers of systems and compendiums take refuge for want of anything better to say."<sup>52</sup> It is required of us to understand the volatility military operations are bound to face; this demands a great awareness which Drake had. It is also mandatory to note the pernicious effects Clausewitz alerts us about, namely those books which are too theoretical and due to that feature become useless as their authors forget to mention reality.

Francis Drake utilized slaves which had managed to break free from Spanish control to aid him during his depredations: "So when the Athenian forces seemed firmly installed

---

<sup>51</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 76

<sup>52</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 46

in Chios with a fortified base, the majority of the slaves immediately deserted to them, and their knowledge of the country was instrumental in doing it the greatest damage."<sup>53</sup> His humble beginnings guaranteed a bond between him and the former slaves as it is difficult to imagine between them and man born in the highest caste of English society. This was something El Draco could extract dividends from, his modest upbringing trained him to deal with every sort of people and it is well known that getting used to wealth and a fancy lifestyle is easier than growing accustomed with the rabble and poverty. The cooperation between the English and the former slaves is a very good example how drastically different factions can work together to beat a common opponent. Albeit Spanish settlers had a feeble and dispersed grip on the Americas they were well aware how even that was at stake:

"The Cimarrones, called Cimaroons in sixteenth-century English, were a crucial factor in Drake's ultimate success in the Americas. Only a year earlier, the bishop of Panama had complained that they represented a real threat to Spanish settlements in the area...They had the inside knowledge of how the Spanish settlements worked. They knew Spanish habits and ways. They were the ones who confirmed to Drake that the settlements were weakly garrisoned, and frequently fell victim to the depredations of French rovers."<sup>54</sup>

El Draque was building a reputation beyond the Atlantic that he couldn't have built in Europe – this was so because of the novelty the Elizabethan expansionism espoused. Europe had known violent aggressions on its shores at least since the dawn of the Viking Age but during the start of the sixteenth century it was unthinkable that similar things could happen in the imperial possessions of the two Iberian Kings. We shouldn't downplay the role mystery and suspense had on the English rise, the raids done in faraway lands were methodically instrumentalized by London which saw with good eyes framing the conflict as a doctrinal one. The Privy Council was aware that the guilt of the criminal acts it sponsored could be alleviated if the strife was presented as a combat between Protestantism and Catholicism even if such presentation was a mere façade. The mob must be excited and its contributions channelled into the defense of the state, a prudent leader should always prefer an unyielding people (even if this is

---

<sup>53</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 433

<sup>54</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 150-151

dangerous at times) rather than a submissive one. The ideal case is having a people that is submissive against internal power and defiant against external forces but if this cannot be achieved one should always choose defiance since if it is well used it can be almost always directed towards the enemies of the prince – national or international.

Everyone likes to think they are the best but there is a great schism between those who actually accomplish an objective and those which claim they could accomplish it if they tried but then never do try. The only king which had had an expedition that circumnavigated the world had been the king of Spain, not Philip but one of his antecessors. Good Queen Bess fancied considering engaging in a mission that would give her and England the honour to imitate such bold and unique voyage – the man chosen to command such adventure was no other than Francis Drake that by 1577 was already known in Europe as *the Pirate*. Nevertheless this operation was not meant to boost England's reputation as others had partially done as it was top secret. The circumnavigation voyage was hatched with three goals in sight: the first was to collect data and in loco reports of areas which had not been explored by her majesty's subjects, namely the Pacific and the Indic oceans. The second was to enlarge English clout over the globe and the third and most important goal was that of measuring English fortitude to understand if it was superficial or if it had the nerve to be profound.

The Dragon was not going to disappoint his queen, he would lead from its commencement until its end a journey full of setbacks and surprises but he would survive to tell the tale – unlike Magellan some decades earlier which had succumbed in the East Indies, his voyage was completed under Elcano's leadership. Many conclusions were reached when Elizabeth's cabinet received the knowledge Drake had harnessed, the first and perhaps most shocking one was how weakly protected the Spanish lands on the Pacific side of the Americas were. Unfortunately for England she could not put this information to good use for her resources did not allow the formation of a team which would focus on the lands of Chile and Peru. The English government underestimated how solid Portuguese penetration in the East really was because Drake entered in contact with its weakest area – Southeast Asia. The Portuguese empire was solid on the eastern coast of Africa, the Persian gulf and the eastern part of India. All those areas were not visited by Drake nor his crew. Drake was however able to find natives which

despised Portuguese presence in the area and were eager to ally themselves with the English – he wasn't fooled by this amity and knew it would be nearly impossible to form a salubrious relationship with them as he had done with the Cimaroons in the Caribbean.

The monetary profit which Drake brought to his queen was incommensurable, when the Golden Hind arrived at Plymouth in September 1580 she brought with her the survival of England: "Without Drake, Elizabeth simply would have been unable to support the Dutch or defend the realm in full measure as she would do over the coming years. Harvesting the sea was beginning to have its distinct attractions."<sup>55</sup> Economically speaking England was snatching a share of the market for its own gain and it should be known that whenever someone gets richer it means that such value had to come from somewhere – the myth that you can produce wealth without stealing it from others is a non-plausible one. Even if you don't rob someone directly you end up robbing him indirectly for a thing cannot be both yours and his. To survive in the economical arena you must be a charming, deadly and lucid gladiator. The evolution England was passing through was one which elevated her in the food chain. England would stop consuming the carcasses left behind by Portuguese and Spanish lions – like a vulture – and would begin striving for the most delicious preys.

During Drake's absence there had occurred an event which could have eternally changed world history – the Battle of Alcácer Quibir – Sebastian's campaign on Moroccan territory. The Portuguese King was fanatically Catholic and he dreamt about reconquering the *Berbería* for the Christian family. The campaign was a disaster and Sebastian died, this opened the throne room to Henry which would rule from 1578 to 1580. He was childless and left Portugal without a proper heir when he departed from this world hence a dynastic drama ensued. The mentioned drama would formulate vast ramifications which had a direct influence on English foreign policy after 1580. Philip II of Spain was son of a Portuguese princess and there existed in Iberia a movement for the restoration of one very powerful kingdom of Medieval Europe which had Toledo as its capital. Philip's bid for the throne was happily received by many Portuguese which longed for the resurrection of the Gothic Hispania.

---

<sup>55</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 241

### 3.4 - Imperator Totius Hispaniae

When Philip's military men launched the attack on Portugal to assure him the throne of one of the wealthiest kingdoms in the world they were very competent and did the task without major troubles. Such task wouldn't have been as easy without Portuguese connivance, the resistance Spain faced was meager and swiftly eliminated. In order to comprehend why we must analyze the Hispanic geopolitical situation. Ever since Gothic Hispania had crumbled in 711 to an army of Muslim Berbers there had existed in the collective memory of the conquered a strong desire to restore the Gothic kingdom. Such desire reached a very important stage when Isabel and Fernando married. The aforementioned marriage approximated Castile and Aragon and their problems and victories commenced to be shared by the two crowns. There was, however, still a kingdom with a significant portion of Hispanic land that wasn't reunited with the other two – Portugal.

That reunion was accomplished due to the work of a very influent and smart man: Cristóvão de Moura. He was a nobleman of important rank and had a particular affinity with the Castilians. His negotiations with Portuguese nobles and clergy were fundamental to assure them that Portugal would remain an independent kingdom with its proper agenda and that they wouldn't be purged. He stated the cultural similarities between all the Iberian peoples, mentioned the Gothic revival and pointed out that it would be very damaging for everyone to try to fight the Castilians out of Portugal – mentioning that a Portuguese victory wasn't a very probable scenario: "In 1580 Philip II was the ruler of all the European settlements so far established in the New World."<sup>56</sup> Albeit this was the perception foreign rulers had the Portuguese were able to resist a little longer, most notably in the Azores, that will be analyzed later on. It is crucial to understand that in the XVI century the word 'Spain' was used to refer to the entire peninsula. Its modern usage only refers to Spain proper and excludes Portugal. The word currently used to define all the peninsula is 'Iberia' a word utilized by the Greeks instead of its synonym Hispania, used by the Romans. The recuperation of the Greek word exemplifies how a bigger kingdom (Castile) can appropriate itself of a previously shared notion. As time went by Spanish culture started to be heavily associated with

---

<sup>56</sup> Wilson, A.N.. The Elizabethans (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 226

Castilian culture, as it occurs in the present. We should not let this current assumption corrupt the sixteenth century reality, Camões, author of the *Lusiadas* (the most legendary Portuguese epic, similar to Beowulf's tale although not as ancient) used to demand the differentiation between Portuguese and Castilians because according to him they were both Spanish. We must also refer the different historical comprehensions, it is indeed true that present day Portuguese tend to associate themselves with Lusitanian culture and see it as dissimilar from Hispanic culture but in the past such schemes didn't impact them as they do today; they were not afraid to present themselves as Hispanic.

The empire on which the sun never sets acquired an even more realistic meaning when Philip II of Spain became Philip I of Portugal, for it is indeed true that such theme was already used during his father's reign. In order to understand what Elizabeth was up against we ought to study Philip's domains and it is indeed true that he wasn't emperor *de jure* but we cannot deny that he indeed was *de facto*. His possessions were known as Hispanic Monarchy and he didn't carry the same title in all of them; in Castile he was King, in Milan he was Duke and in *Flandes* he was Lord. The magnitude of Philip's empire was unbelievable and he had to recur to the Councils (*Consejos*) of each land to assess him about the specific situations each of them faced. The king of Spain inherited from his father the Council of Castile, the Council of Aragon, the Council of Flanders, the Council of the Indies and created two more, the Council of Italy in the start of his reign and the Council of Portugal (that overlooked not only mainland Portugal but all the oversea dominions from Rio de Janeiro to Macau) when he became its king.

It is clear that nobody can smoothly rule a land without having a deal with the locals and Philip knew this, he was also aware of the necessity to have committed members to his cause because without their insightful opinions his grip could become too fragile: "Since men judge things by their results, all the evil that comes about is blamed upon the one who gave the advice, and if things turn out well, he is commended for it; but the reward is far from counterbalancing the blame."<sup>57</sup> One of his greatest achievements was convincing his Italian partners, particularly the Neapolitans and the Sicilians that he was determined to blend their future with his own and consequently they were less afraid to commit themselves to his cause. The creation of the Council of Italy reveals to us two

---

<sup>57</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. Discourses on Livy Book III (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 338

vivid facts. The first was the gradual disintegration of Aragonese power and the second was the importance of southern Italy on Spanish strategy. These two happenings were part of the Castilian project to become more encroached on Aragon and to assume the central role Sicily and Naples had to play in the combat against Islam. The Spanish were able to comprehend that southern Italy was the vanguard of the most important fight, if the sultan was able to deploy an army that reached its shores all Europe would be in peril. Stendhal once said that Europe only has two capitals, Paris and Naples. This is revealing enough to show how much the Spaniards counted on southern Italy in the fight against the Ottoman Empire.

Felipe II is often bashed as a tyrant, he is represented as more bloodthirsty and cruel than most of his counterparts. This evaluation is unfair and is directly derived from the amazingly skilled Protestant propagandists. On balance he was neither better nor worse than all the other rulers, for it is well known that if you want to prevail you have to be ruthless and crafty:

"One must understand this: a prince, and especially a new prince, cannot observe all those things for which men are considered good, because in order to maintain the state he must often act against his faith, against charity, against humanity, and against religion. And so it is necessary that he should have a mind ready to turn itself according to the way the winds of Fortune and the changing circumstances command him. And, as I said above, he should not depart from the good if it is possible to do so, but he should know how to enter into evil when forced by necessity."<sup>58</sup>

The Iberian King inflicted a lethal defeat to the Ottoman Empire, rendered impossible the reconstruction of Al-Andalus or the Muslim conquest of Italy, helped to save Catholicism in France and if his successors had been as competent as he was the Dutch rebels would have had a far more difficult life. When he died Spain remained the number one power. Machiavelli says that you have to be able to keep up with the events, if you are not willing to change according to the problems posed by Fortune you will succumb. The key word here is adaptability. It is of grand importance that you are

---

<sup>58</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 61

cognizant of your enemy – you cannot wage the same type of war against enemies with different characteristics.

A prudent prince should always try to avoid the devastation of war inside his borders, a powerful state tends to fight its battles away from its territory – Philip did this, he shielded his peninsula as much as he could and took the fight beyond it, to the Mediterranean Sea, Atlantic Ocean, France, Italy and Flanders. The battle in which he was less successful was the one which covered the Atlantic immensity – this is a direct consequence of the strategy he employed, for it is in the order of things that resources are finite and so if you use them in one front they will expire and not be available to be used in another.

It would be unwise to try to grasp how the Spanish Empire operated without paying attention to the man which called the shots. Some clarification over Philip's personality is required for us to get acquainted with his vision for we should know that politics are conducted by people, so people matter. Charles V was a guiding light for his son, he explained him the heavy burden which men like them carry and how one should not try to minimize important matters. One very important advice was how practical but dangerous it would be to reduce the men he dealt with. Charles warned him if he did this he would start to be too dependent on a specific group and even if this spared him precious time it was overall a bad choice. His mother wasn't permitted to nurture and advise him for long: "In 1539 Philip suffered the most tragic event of his young life, the death of his mother. She had had a miscarriage in late April and died on May 1, three weeks before Philip's twelfth birthday. Becoming ill while he walked in the funeral procession, Philip returned to his rooms and was put to bed. His mother's body was taken to Granada and buried in the royal tombs, where King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella were buried."<sup>59</sup> Philip's mother was dead but the lessons she taught him accompanied him until his own death; the love for the real religion – Roman Catholicism – and the love for Portugal. Even after Isabel's death her son continued to deal with her Portuguese entourage and this illuminates how Castilian and Portuguese destinies were commencing to merge. The prince's Portuguese governess Leonor de Mascarenhas continued to be an important influence. Philip, just like Gloriana, soon

---

<sup>59</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 5

understood the ephemerality of life and this forged his personality, he endured a violent shock and learnt to suffer which is a paramount characteristic for one which will one day be called to govern.

The prince received a diversified education which would permit him to be a jack of all trades, yet master of none: "In 1541, the year that Philip made his first communion, Charles appointed three new tutors for Philip, one to teach Latin and Greek, one to teach math and architecture, and another to teach geography and history."<sup>60</sup> Besides his education there was an event which drastically made him realize how different he was from his father – his European journey. During the voyage (1548-1551) he visited Italy, the Holy Roman Empire and the Netherlands. His shyness and parochialism obstructed his ability to convince his future subjects of his qualities. This was particularly grave in the Netherlands, his father hoped that he could make the inverse process he went through – born in the Netherlands he went to reign in Spain, learned Castilian and adopted her culture as his own. Philip could not or did not want to, he didn't speak French and was very disturbed with the insolence and loose morals of his future subjects. Charles was cosmopolitan and accessible, Philip was conservative and distant, Charles spent a lot of time travelling through his domains, Philip was far more static, Charles was a past example of present Europeanism, Philip was essentially Luso-Castilian.

The future king of Spain had comprehended he would never be adored in the Netherlands: "And as in other things, so in men, not the seller, but the buyer determines the Price. For let a man (as most men do,) rate themselves as the highest Value they can; yet their true Value is no more than it is esteemed by others."<sup>61</sup> Those which were powerful and influential in the Low Countries disdained foreign impositions and never really accommodated to the idea that a son of Spain would be their Lord. Philip had the clairvoyance to infer the animosity directed towards him – he didn't seek validation from those he knew he could not obtain it from. He is known in Spain as the prudent king, his story renders us no doubt about his passion for his job; he always tried to reassure those he felt worthy since after hearing their demands or anxieties he would tenderly whisper 'Sosegaos' meaning 'Tranquillize thyself'.

---

<sup>60</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 7

<sup>61</sup> Hobbes, Thomas. *The Leviathan* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 37

### 3.5 - Divide and Conquer

When Portugal seemed to be swallowed by Spanish might the English and the French were immensely preoccupied; they understood that the union between Spain and Portugal would be damaging to their plans so they decided to support António, Prior of Crato. Their objectives were crystal clear, they applied the technique divide and conquer, hoping to have an Iberian partner against Philip. The reports which reached Paris and London were not reassuring but this is never a bad thing: " ' I could have sent you a different and more agreeable report, but that would not have served you better: you need to make your decisions with a clear view of the situation here ' " <sup>62</sup> The previous quote gives us a poignant advice – honesty is often brutal and depressing but in order to survive the perils that you face you should never sugarcoat difficulties, be blunt, be incisive, be veracious. Elizabeth remained unconvinced about the pressing issue, she was already engaged in two costly operations: piracy around the globe and covert support for the Netherlands. She wasn't fully committed to António's cause but she counted on French power to disrupt Spanish interests. Gloriana suspected the Kingdom of France was going to be more generous than her and this tranquillized her, it is never a good idea to leave your concerns on foreign hands but when your resources are meager and you are not willing to gamble you have no other choice.

She wasn't wrong and once again Catherine de Médicis was behind the bulk of French audacity. Catherine assembled a significant relief force under her protégé Philippe Strozzi and in June 1582 his armada departed with some English participants (although Elizabeth wasn't very keen on it, sixteenth century England already had an important degree of private initiative) to make sure the Azores would remain hostile to Spain. In July 1582 Strozzi faced Bazán in the Battle of São Miguel, Clausewitz renders us a sublime explanation to comprehend the decisiveness of a battle: "In a battle both sides strive to conquer; that is true polarity, for the victory of the one side destroys that of the other." <sup>63</sup> Strozzi was a competent leader, he had fought against the Ottoman Empire, the Huguenots and Spanish continental troops but he was unable to beat the Marquis of Santa Cruz. Don Álvaro's ships were able to hold their ground when their adversaries

---

<sup>62</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 370

<sup>63</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 9

boarded them and were able to repeal the offensive. It is mandatory to mention that when fights descended into a melee (like it had happened at Lepanto) Spanish steel and dexterity usually overpowered its opponents. The loss of life in the Azores wasn't completely wasted, for both the English and the French were realizing how suicidal it was to imitate its enemy's boarding tactics. The Battle for the Azores was crucial to comprehend that new tactics had to be sought, the English would notably evolve to a new state of mind – they were starting to use their swifter vessels to bet on maneuverability and hence escape boarding attempts. The following year Santa Cruz returned to subdue the last rebellious island – Terceira – his army composed of Spaniards and Portuguese (loyal to Philip) beat a force of English, French and Portuguese (loyal to Anthony) this marked the end of the War of the Portuguese succession which had been going on since 1580.

We must point out the fragility on the pretender's bid for the Portuguese throne, he resorted to troops which were not his, this almost always ends in disaster, one way or another:

"THE other kind of worthless army, auxiliary troops, are those that arrive when you call a powerful prince to bring his forces to your aid and defence, as was done in recent times by Pope Julius, who, having witnessed the sad showing of his mercenary soldiers in the campaign of Ferrara, turned to auxiliary soldiers and made an agreement with Ferdinand, King of Spain, that he should assist him with his soldiers and armies. These soldiers can be useful and good in themselves, but for the man who summons them they are almost always harmful. If they lose, you are destroyed; if they win, you end up their prisoner."<sup>64</sup>

When we observe the totality of the problems posed to Prior of Crato we rapidly fathom that Machiavelli's words ring true, the auxiliary fighters he used were destroyed but if they had been successful he would have become their prisoner and a puppet Azorean government would have been created. This is contained on an even harsher reality, it is impossible for us to actually say how many Portuguese were keen on having Philip as their king but we cannot deny the overwhelming evidence that suggests many influent

---

<sup>64</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 47

men preferred to side with Castile. Two similarities will suffice to explain how Lisbon and Madrid felt close to each other. The first similarity is religious, both nations were devoutly Catholic and didn't tolerate other doctrines. The aforementioned reason distanced Portugal from England and in a way from France too since French soil was a pertinent battleground between Protestants and Catholics and at this time it was unclear who the victors would be. The second semblance were their enemies: Spain contained Islam in the Mediterranean and Portugal contained it in the Indic Ocean and they battled attacks on their colonies which were usually performed by English or Huguenots corsairs. António's defeat occurred due to the various fronts England and France had to deal with, as we know states will seek their survival and grandness so this obliges them to desert mercy and justice: "He should have known better than to believe that Elizabeth would involve herself in certain war with Spain. After all, she had by and large ignored his earlier plea for help when Spain overran the Portuguese mainland in 1580."<sup>65</sup>

Meanwhile in the Low Countries everyone was trying to drive a wedge between other present factions. Since the Union of Arras (January 6, 1579) and its response the Union of Utrecht (January 23, 1579) the rallying figure of the northern provinces, William the Taciturn, was convinced the Duke of Anjou's nominal authority over those lands would be a dissuasive element to the Spaniards. So Orange's ruse was the following: utilize French clout to curb Spanish supremacy and divide the Catholic nations. Anjou wanted to be more than a nominal ruler and this made him follow the classic French posture, let Spain batter Holland hard so its leaders would have to give in to his demands. At the same time he didn't want a decisive Spanish victory as this would undermine his chances of success. Parma tried to secure French amity and foster suspicion between the Gauls and the Dutch. England was the less present actor in the Netherlands for strategic reasons. The English state was rooting for the least probable outcome, an independent Dutch victory which wouldn't bring benefits neither to France nor to Spain. The *French Fury* was the event which allowed the Dutch to see Alençon's true colours, when the assault on Antwerp didn't go as predicted the natives started to distrust French motives. William of Orange succeeded in soothing their outrage but the damage had been done – part of the population believed the French to be no better than the Spaniards. Since 1583 the northern Calvinist states would commence to see England as the only suitable

---

<sup>65</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 256

partner, this happened because English objectives appeared to be the same as theirs – fighting Catholicism and reducing Spanish and French strength. The Virgin Queen used Francis on more than one occasion to scare Spain, a marriage between the two would produce an alliance between their nations and Philip II was worried about it. The support the insular nation gave to Francis' position in the Netherlands was done hoping Spain wouldn't be able to have a solid position along the Germanic Sea.

The French campaign in the Low Countries remains cloudy to this day but as a nation which dreamt about replacing Spain as the most powerful entity she could not avoid the showdown, sometimes someone's presence is fundamental even if the goal is not clearly defined and can oscillate between contradictory ideas:

"They had come to share either in the conquest of the country or in its rescue, but their particular alignment was not determined by any justifying cause or kindred loyalty so much as by purely contingent factors of self-interest or compulsion."<sup>66</sup>

Whether Anjou's men ended up conquering or saving the Low Countries their presence changed the board. We cannot omit the presence of another important force in the conflict – mercenaries from the Holy Roman Empire. These troops were brought in and fought on both sides. France ultimately recalled her men and was unwilling to use precious funds on dubious activities. François' intervention didn't subdue or save the Netherlands but it was a decent situation which was able to let everyone know that France was an active player. England was the indisputable winner, she bore no great expenses and watched from beyond the channel Spaniards, Dutch and Frenchmen hammer each other. Elizabeth Tudor knew that harvesting the sea was a far more rewarding activity (and less compromising for her crown) so she kept supporting her merchant adventurers and hoarding riches to protect her future.

1584 was an *annus horribilis* for England, the deaths of two important figures regarding English foreign policy took place: "On June 10, 1584, the duke of Anjou, who had provided the French marriage card that Elizabeth had played whenever Philip threatened her, died of tuberculosis in France. On July 10, Prince William of Orange, chief leader

---

<sup>66</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 394

of the continuing Netherlands revolt, was assassinated at Delft, apparently at Philip's behest. Elizabeth could now foresee the defeat of the Netherlands revolt by Philip's nephew, Alexander Farnese, the duke of Parma, who was proving himself a formidable foe on the battlefield, and once the Netherlands had been subdued, Philip would turn his full attention – and Parma's menacing army – on England."<sup>67</sup> The realist theory of international relations stresses the necessity to depart from reality if you want to arrive at the desired destination. This obligates you to instrumentalize the existing actors, not only Nation-States, religions or factions but also persons. Elizabeth's cabinet was shockingly good in harmonizing English interests and current events – articulating apparently unconnected parcels. Anjou was gone and with him the convenient menace of marrying England to France. Orange was no more, after his assassination it seemed like the Dutch revolution was orphaned, losing its most inspiring and charismatic member. Both men had been used by English policy as real agents which albeit not serving England directly did serve her indirectly.

English action didn't take too long to be decided, it was imperative to reduce Spanish advantages and with France out of the way England had to do it herself. England's reputation was far better now than when Good Queen Bess had become queen; Protestantism was alive but Lutherans and Calvinists regarded Anglicanism as an unworthy reform, too many papal features remained such as the chasuble or the crucifix. But if we analyze the situation purely from a military position we are quickly persuaded that the Catholic nemesis wasn't Amsterdam, Geneva or Hamburg but London.

Alejandro Farnesio had his eyes set on Antwerp, Walsingham and Dudley were among those who alerted the queen for the unpredictable consequences that such fall might induce. The Roman aphorism *Si vis pacem, para bellum* meaning 'If you want peace, prepare for war' was being followed by the English and Spanish governments – they claimed to want peace but not at any cost – they were reluctant to rely on their opponents' honesty. What engenders peace is the balance of power or the fear to be defeated or even worse, obliterated. On balance the struggle for the Low Countries was benefic for England, it taught her to commit and to be courageous.

---

<sup>67</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 223-224

### 3.6 - One of a kind – El Draco

Violence can be divided in two types. The first sort has no political backing, the second sort is pursued having a political reason. Violence without political backing is proper of the beasts that roam the earth, men sometimes fall into bestiality and this makes them cause troubles that should be avoided. Such type of violence usually occurs when we let the emotional win over the rational or when we allow the biological to defeat the civilizational. I should point out that this doesn't mean the civilizational should defile the biological but it should calm it through civilized elevation. It is now time to mention violence perpetrated with a political purpose. The political purpose is the reason why violence occurs, thus this action is constructed by a state or a group with political ambition (the creation of its own state or furthering some ideal). The tactics employed by the two can be the same, a quick example will suffice to demonstrate this. A rape can happen simply because of biological urges or personal deviation but it can also happen because an army is marking its territory in an enemy land, using virility as a symbol of its domination.

Whoever occupies himself with politics must not neglect the importance of arms for it is well known that unarmed political institutions only subsist because of submission:

"Moses, Cyrus, Theseus, and Romulus could not have made their institutions respected for long if they had been unarmed; as in our times happened to Brother Girolamo Savonarola, who was ruined in his new institutions when the populace began to believe in them no longer, since he had no way of holding steady those who had believed, nor of making the unbelievers believe."<sup>68</sup> Elizabeth was cognizant of the importance of arms, that was why she opted for a strategy which did not undermine her military fiber. She had to deal with ambitious and skilled men which could have caused her too many problems, the way she was able to align their wishes with her own agenda show a firm conviction and a reasonable self-esteem. Elizabethan England produced a man that is still admired today for his combat techniques, navigation expertise and seaborne attacks and retreats. His name was Francis Drake, known to history as Sir Francis Drake, arguably the most famous pirate that ever lived, a man that personifies the importance military institutions carry.

---

<sup>68</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 23

We are obliged to make a detour which will permit us to understand a bit more about Drake's youth, a period of his life that was convoluted and eye-opening. The most emblematic figure of Gloriana's reign had his beliefs challenged and his resilience tested from a tender age – such moment would never fade from his memory: "When the conservative Catholics of the West Country rose in protest, in 1549, against the introduction of Edward VI's first Prayer Book, the mob hated the Drakes for their Protestantism. The Drakes had their farm trashed, and they escaped to Gillingham in Kent, where Edmund Drake housed his family in an old ship."<sup>69</sup> This event has two very pertinent consequences which eternally influenced Drake – his geographical shift from west to east and his realization of the existence of a visceral religious conflict.

Before his family escaped to Kent he had lived in Devonshire; South West England has always been poorer than South East England. The necessity to escape Devonshire was a blessing in disguise, at first sight it seems a horrible cruelty but this shift east permitted Drake's contact with the richest area of the country, hence his opportunities to do well in life increased substantially. Ever since 1066 the south eastern parts of England (including East Anglia) have been more prosperous than its western or northern counterparts. After the Norman conquest the areas from Winchester to Norwich were rapidly stabilized and did not challenge Norman rule, at least not as strongly and decidedly as did the west and the north. The aftermath of the Norman regime lives on, not only during Drake's epoch but even today. Living in Kent made Drake fit for his first adventure, that of serving as an apprentice on a trading ship which allowed him to have a privileged relationship with the sea and contact with France. Obviously there existed sailors around Tavistock too but they were usually poorer than their eastern counterparts and dealt with undeveloped areas like Welsh territories and not France.

The second consequence is ecclesiastical, Francis Drake soon realized there was a war going on, a war between Protestantism and Catholicism. His escape to Kent permitted him to be ever closer to the grand center of power – London. He started to notice that power was distributed unevenly around the country and the areas closer to London certainly seemed to him far better off than those far away. His inquisitive spirit made

---

<sup>69</sup> Wilson, A.N.. The Elizabethans (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 173

him search for responses, his intelligence made him pause and ponder about what role should he play in the doctrinal feud. Elizabeth's government followed a strategy which succeeded, that of enrolling south-western men into the navy – slowly but surely the south west was being subdued, it was relinquishing its loyalty to Rome and was proving to be a hotbed of competent mariners: "Southampton and Plymouth spawned great adventurers, merchant, gentlemen, and piratical – with such evocative West Country names as Champernowne, Hawkins, Fiennes, Godolphin, Grenville, Gilbert, Killigrew, and Drake."<sup>70</sup> One is forced to wonder why did London choose the west over the north; there are two practical explanations. The north had always retained its particularities, which were directly derived from Scandinavian settlers which had never really answered to the south – their powerbase was York which derives from Jórviik (Norse dialect). The western Britons were less combative and more compromising than the Scandinavians. The other feasible explanation is offered to us by geography – the privy council was sincerely more worried with France than with Scotland, even if they could act together, securing the west meant decreasing French power, securing the north meant decreasing Scottish power – England chose wisely.

Drake's participation in his cousin's expeditions reveal the necessity to be taken under someone's wing in order to progress. The experience Francis harnessed during his youth travelling on board of the merchant ship could have been useless if he had not been helped by John Hawkins: "While they sailed along the Guinea coast, they encountered some French pirates who had taken a Portuguese ship. Hawkins 'impounded' the Portuguese *Gratia Dei* (Grace of God) and gave Francis Drake his first command as her captain."<sup>71</sup> Such event happened in 1567, we can only speculate about what made Hawkins pick Drake to lead the *Gratia Dei* but it is not ridiculous to believe that he had an advantage over other men because of their blood ties. Notwithstanding such connection I don't want to suggest a relationship of the same type cannot occur between non-related individuals. The Dragon learned a great deal from John Hawkins because he respected him, one of the most important features in a fruitful relationship is respect, without respecting our professor we are not able to candidly hear his opinion nor let his sapience flow through us.

---

<sup>70</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 22

<sup>71</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 117

It is now imperative that I mention the constant tension a warrior suffers when he is striding through the road of victory – the necessity to control his sentiments, not allowing these to render him feeble, predictable or impatient: "Neither vanity, thirst for glory, nor vengeance could make him deviate from his course, and this course alone it is which brought him to a fortunate termination of the contest."<sup>72</sup> The warrior must dissociate himself from a blind pursuit of power which if followed will stop him from carrying out the role he has been chosen to perform:

"The Passions that most of all cause the differences of Wit, are principally, the more or lesse Desire of Power, of Riches, of Knowledge, and of Honour. All which may be reduced to the first, that is Desire of Power. For Riches, Knowledge and Honour are but severall sorts of Power."<sup>73</sup>

The tension is exemplified between the warrior's continual decision-making process, that of opting for his group rather than himself as an individual, that of opting for duty instead of exhibitionism, that of opting for privations instead of pleasures. Although the warriors must be able to control their attraction to power this attraction must continue to exist for if it ceases to entice the warrior he will no longer be useful. The part played by men of higher rank (such as Drake when he started being a leader rather than a follower) is determinant in the outcome of any battle; they must be able to direct their inferiors in a way that doesn't break their morale but at the same time that doesn't empower it too much. If their morale is shattered their productivity will lose its momentum, such possibility is very dangerous for it can create deserters or even worse, leechlike members. Deserters abandon their brothers in arms, their faith, their nation since they think their lives are more important than their duty, these are the second most despicable creatures a military commander can encounter, their individualism saps greater purposes, Nietzsche named them *the last men*. Leechlike members are even more perilous than deserters for they pretend their superior can count on them and stay around leeching resources and when the battle is upon them they show signs of desperation, can't follow orders properly and are always trying to subvert the military command, hoping to save their skin. We can then conclude that it is better to have fewer

---

<sup>72</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 106

<sup>73</sup> Hobbes, Thomas. *The Leviathan* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 30

men but men which will perform than to have more soldiers which will evade the combat and ignore orders.

A morale that is too empowered can produce the opposite effect, that of trying to do everything alone or believing too much on one's own judgement. Devastating results will be produced for a simple soldier cannot (or should not) start a process just because he feels it is the right thing to do. Of course there are exceptions, Napoleon is probably the most pertinent one, however great men like Napoleon are very rare, most soldiers that try to assume the leadership on the battlefield end up being more pernicious than beneficial. Those that try to do everything alone are corrupted by avarice, for they desire their names to echo through the ages, these however are less problematic than those who trust too much on their own judgement; these are profaned by vanity for they hold the credo that their vision is the right one.

Perhaps Elizabeth's greatest achievement regarding military decisions was feasible because of her sex. Here, like in other occasions, she knew how to extract value from being a woman. Male princes often need to back their political power through manliness, and the place *par excellence* to do it is the battlefield; this is not a problem when the prince is a competent warrior, but when this is not the case his reputation can be damaged by his inability to perform on the battlefield. Good Queen Bess was not expected to fight so this allowed her to give free rein to her armed forces without enfeebling her authority: "Besides this, the senate would have been obliged to give advice on a matter about which it could not have known anything, since notwithstanding the fact that the senate was filled with men highly experienced in warfare, nevertheless, not being on the spot and not knowing the countless details that must be known in order to give good advice, they would have committed countless errors in giving it."<sup>74</sup> The state designates the objective; the armed forces act in accordance to what the state demands of them but its action needs to be independent from the political power.

---

<sup>74</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. Discourses on Livy Book II (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 245

### 3.7 - Walsingham - The Queen's most gifted Warlock

Civilizations commence when the individuals that inhabit the state of nature decide to desert it to create something in common, to establish rules, codes and frontiers:

"The Greatest of humane Powers, is that which is compounded of the Powers of most men, united by consent, in one person, Naturall, or civill, that has the use of all their Powers depending on his will; such as is the Power of the Common-wealth: or depending on the wills of each particular; such as is the Power of a Faction, or of divers factions leagued. Therefore to have servants, is Power, To have Friends, is Power: for they are strengths united."<sup>75</sup>

Once the state has been born until it ceases to exist it will require men that serve its will, Elizabeth was able to count on an extremely efficient of such men, his name was Francis Walsingham. Walsingham, unlike Drake, was born in Kent, one of the best places to be born in England. A comparison between the two Francis is an interesting one, Walsingham was from a preminent family and didn't have to go through the troubles Drake faced but his role was just as important. This reveals us that a state should be able to extract value from all its citizens, not only those who are highborn nor only the rabble – talent can be found on the entirety of the social spectrum. Walsingham studied at King's College, Cambridge, one of the most prestigious institutions one could attend. When Queen Mary occupied the English throne he decided to emigrate, he spent all of Mary's reign away in continental Europe where he was able to cement a precious network which would earn him his nickname – the spymaster. When Gloriana replaced her half-sister at the head of the English state he returned home, believing that perhaps now he could serve his sovereign which had not been the case when a Catholic agenda was being followed. This moment is crucial to understand Walsingham, we can tell that he was a man with a profound rectitude and could not escape his conscience, there are times when a state demands too much of his servants like ask them to forget about their ecclesiastical doctrines in order to wipe out their resistance to its agenda. Here we find a compulsory lesson that all states should learn from; it is always better to have men which are moved by the state's cause, even if they are less brilliant than their

---

<sup>75</sup> Hobbes, Thomas. *The Leviathan* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 36

unconvinced peers. If you manage to deal with persons that possess a deep attachment to their nation and at the same time share that state's vision you have found the most competent and engaged individuals you will ever come across.

Sir Francis Walsingham was an obstinate statesman, his role in Elizabeth's government was immense – only matched by Lord Burghley – there he made several incursions into different areas but all with the same goal, that of rendering Gloriana's regime plus stable and strong. I will shed light upon three strategies that were followed – education, plantation and purification.

Whoever controls the children controls the future: "Just as for the brief years of Mary Tudor's reign the Catholics had attempted to further their ideas among children, so with the accession of Elizabeth there was a systematic insistence that the children be imbued not only with new learning, but also with the faith of the Reformation."<sup>76</sup> The sad truth is that any type of education ends up being an indoctrination for if we do not propel something as veritable we are opening the door for the establishment of nihilism. This is so for if we cannot rank things we will not be able to distinguish right from wrong and if we are educated to have a pluralistic stance and embrace different visions we end up not being congruent at all, our thought ceases to make sense because we contradict it every two minutes. This also leads to people that believe in everything which is the same as believing in nothing. Enlightened statesmen are aware of this so they conceive a strategy to safeguard the interests of the Nation-State, promoting what they see fit for its survival among the youngsters. Gramsci's extrapolation from Marx is quite revealing of this; his objective was that of eradicating the bourgeois culture for only then would the proletariat truly reign. Allow me to extrapolate from Gramsci's extrapolation; it is then clear the importance culture carries, it is one of the most important barriers for a state. That is why if its children are not brought up the right way they will stop defending their culture and become alienated by another; Gramsci's mistake like that of many Marxists is that they destroy all the frontiers seeing a struggle between the rich and the poor, in fact what does actually occur is a clash between several cultures and not between those who have access to the means of production and those who have not.

---

<sup>76</sup> Wilson, A.N.. The Elizabethans (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 77

A state cannot just think about the present, it has to develop a strategy for the future. It is massively disrespectful that a state doesn't think about the generations that will come, if incompetence takes the upper hand long-term projects are rapidly forgotten and a mentality promoting *carpe diem* will thenceforth dominate. Fortunately for Elizabeth and England Walsingham was not a man given to frivolous matters and he comprehended very well that the Americas were large and precious, hoping one day England could form decent plantations there as she had done in Ireland: "At his behest and specific commission, Hakluyt published his Discourse of Western Planting in 1584 in support of Raleigh's Virginia project for the queen's and Walsingham's eyes only."<sup>77</sup> The spymaster endorsed such project because he understood that England would have to embrace the world if she wanted to remain independent, the colonies would provide a solid base in the Americas that would permit the imitation of what the Portuguese and the Spaniards were already doing – resources would be multiplied, the crown's status would be improved and a stronghold in the west would be militarily beneficial.

Albeit the project was tempting, Walsingham also knew that it wasn't very wise to focus too much on it, he had to deal with far more pressing problems such as the Dutch Question. However he didn't block the process from flowing which other less experienced men may had been tempted to. The seed for what would eventually become the Thirteen Colonies was being carefully planted for one must prepare for what is yet to come. Her majesty's warlock felt it was appropriate to let sane individuals explore their own fantasies, as long as those didn't damage the state – he knew that excessive control and restrictions end up killing imagination and without it the capability of a state to renew itself grows weaker.

In Protestant circles (Lutheran and Calvinist alike) Rome was known as *Whore of Babylon*, Walsingham certainly agreed with that denomination, during Mary Tudor's rule he was able to solidify his friendship with continental Protestants, most specifically with Calvinists or Huguenots as they were known in France. On the other hand Rome saw the spymaster as a devious warlock which channelled his dark forces to stop her glorious splendor, England would have been reduced if she didn't count on his dedication and competence. The warlock's informants made him aware of a plot to

---

<sup>77</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 268

murder Elizabeth, the man which was the central piece of the plan was named Francis Throckmorton and the plot is known today as Throckmorton plot (1583). Walsingham's web was very sticky, once someone had been glued to such web it was almost impossible to retrieve his liberty. His partners in France were able to discover that Henry, Duke of Guise, was supposed to lead an invasion of England – he was the head of the French Catholic league – the funds would be provided by the king of Spain and the Pope. Due to Walsingham's abnormal efficiency the plan was never set in motion but it would produce harsh consequences, among them the tightening of liberty – liberty is a value always abandoned when the survival of the state is at stake.

As I've recently noted through Hobbes' teachings, factions are powerful and they have their own *raison d'être*, the Romans never tolerated an *imperium in imperio*. No sovereign state can tolerate a state within its own state. The Jesuits in England were exactly that. A powerful faction which had its own agenda and in the Throckmorton plot they were going to play a considerable role, providing assistance to the Duke of Guise's army and inducing the English people to rebel against their monarch. Extreme times require extreme measures: "The cruelty with which the recusants were treated by Walsingham's spy network and torture-chambers has never been forgotten, not least because so many of the victims were at a much later date declared to be saints of the Church. The martyrologists on both sides on the painful argument polarised opinion until our own day, and continue to do so."<sup>78</sup> In 1584 the parliament ratified an act against the Jesuits and other possible fifth columns in England, therefore granting its independence and removing the possibility of a faction that could disrupt the crown during an invasion. The aphorism *time is nothing, timing is everything* is quite representative of the aforementioned situation, one will later on discover how useful this procedure was.

A prince must hear different opinions from those he holds, that is why I believe Walsingham was more important than Cecil. He told Elizabeth what she didn't want to hear and was a constant reminder of the need to be internationally active: "Timely Resolution, or determination of what a man is to do, is Honourable; as being the contempt of small difficulties, and dangers. And Irresolution, Dishonourable; as a signe

---

<sup>78</sup> Wilson, A.N.. The Elizabethans (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 113

of too much valuing of little impediments, and little advantages: For when a man has weighed things as long as the time permits, and resolves not, the difference of weight is but little; and therefore if he resolve not, he overvalues little things, which is Pusillanimity."<sup>79</sup> His deep knowledge regarding European affairs made him back his opinions with facts, such was the way he was able to slowly turn Elizabeth from her non-interventionist stance to one which could accept international operations that weren't covert. He made her comprehend when she could vacillate no longer and justified the perks of timely resolution.

Francis Walsingham had made himself indispensable to his queen, this is the synonym of power for if you attain a position of high recognition and there is nobody capable of replacing you there is little to fear, the prince must learn to deal with you. Being a worthy devotee is something difficult to reach for there will be times that your devotion to the state will make you do things that are contrary to your beliefs or that will desecrate your conscience. That situation is a real trial by fire, the greatest servitors are those that can emancipate themselves from the shackles of their own moral to preserve imperfect institutions that nevertheless shield us from the state of nature:

"This approach deserves to be noted and imitated by any citizen who finds himself giving advice to his native city, because where the ultimate decision concerning the safety of one's country is to be taken, no consideration of what is just or unjust, merciful or cruel, praiseworthy or shameful, should be permitted; on the contrary, putting aside every other reservation, one should follow in its entirety the policy that saves its life and preserves its liberty. This approach is imitated in word and deed by the French when they defend the majesty of their king and the power of their kingdom; for this reason, they hear no voice with more impatience than one which declares: 'This policy is disgraceful for the king' ; for they say that their king cannot suffer shame in any of his decisions, either in good or in adverse fortune, because if he wins or if he loses, everyone agrees it is entirely a king's affair."<sup>80</sup>

Walsingham did not fail, he aided England and she remained free.

---

<sup>79</sup> Hobbes, Thomas. *The Leviathan* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 39

<sup>80</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book III* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 350

### 3.8 - The Malevolent Witch

During the Middle Ages redheads were considered to be witches, vampires and werewolves; such hair colour, being quite rare, was definitely spoken of and it caused both fascination and fear. Since Gloriana was a redhead her enemies felt appropriate to propagate that stereotype, portraying her as unholy, devious and mysterious. The kings of Spain and France and the popes did see the queen of England as a malevolent witch that frustrated their plans – propaganda was not only used by the Protestants, the Catholics made sure to apply it as well. One is then obliged to wonder why did Protestant propaganda produced better results than its Catholic challenger. I possess an explanation that can help us figure it out. When a new order (Protestantism) is subverting the rules of an older one (Catholicism) it has nearly always less to lose than the one which currently rules. The new order knows it is the underdog so it goes to great lengths to shatter the existing structure and implement its own conceptions; the old order has to defend a citadel under siege and while doing so it must try to prevent the spread of toxins that will contaminate its organism – this means that it has to be more cautious and less progressive or innovative, having much more to lose than the newcomers.

Good Queen Bess' private life was marked by two very different men. The first was Thomas Seymour and the second was Robert Dudley. The former marked her negatively and the latter marked her positively.

Thomas Seymour married her father's last wife, Catherine Parr, with whom she lived. Seymour was an ambitious man, gallant, courageous and extremely decided to further his position through marriage. After Henry VIII's death he rapidly seduced and married Catherine Parr. He had already thought about marrying one of the king's daughters and it isn't weird to imagine that his approximation to Parr had a lot to do with the young princess. I believe Elizabeth had a very troubled childhood in which she was demoted when her father ordered the execution of Anne Boleyn and married Jane Seymour; from a tender age she observed her surroundings and understood that men would court her for her status rather than for herself:

"This was a formidably clever, and slightly frightening, young person who had never fully opened her heart to anyone – not to her terrifying monster of a father; not to Catherine Parr, who had been such a wise stepmother, and certainly not to Parr's reprehensible husband Thomas Seymour, whose scandalous cuddlings and attempts to make love to the young princess had caused public outrage."<sup>81</sup>

Seymour's improper behaviour alerted her about lust and the importance of marital alliances, this was a lesson that she would never forget that kept haunting her for most of her life. As twisted and perverse as this seems through XXI century standards I do agree with those that say that Elizabeth felt in a way flattered by Seymour's advances; a woman always feels flattered when she knows that she is more desired than others and I have no reason to think Elizabeth was any different. The shenanigans they engaged in taught her how to keep men at bay but at the same time not letting them disappear over the horizon – precious knowledge that she would display when reigning. Catherine Parr's husband was the prime example she had that she lived in a man's world, a world where women were subjugated to the will of men – this she did not like – we cannot say that her decision to remain unmarried was just because of Somerset but it seems to me that his role was crucial. She wanted to have no master.

The other man that influenced her private life was Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, this one had a far more positive impact, he was undeniably very close to her, what leads me to think that the Virgin Queen wasn't so virgin after all:

"The one she was really interested in – the only one – was her handsome master of the horse, Robert Dudley. Around April 1559 he became an obvious favorite. Elizabeth had him move from his former apartment in the palace into a suite next to hers. She took him riding with her almost every day. They spent evenings together, talking and laughing and singing to their own musical accompaniment. She also had her serious times with him, talking over matters of state, although he was not a member of her council, and letting him influence her about them, igniting further jealousy among her councilors. Feria, while he was still Philip's envoy, reported that Dudley 'has come so much in favor that he does whatever he likes with affairs and it is even said that her

---

<sup>81</sup> Wilson, A.N.. The Elizabethans (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 27

majesty visits him in his chamber day and night.' Of course, if Elizabeth was in love with Dudley and intended to marry him, his wife, Amy, would be a problem to be solved. Court scuttlebutt had the solution. 'People talk of this so freely,' Feria told Philip, 'that they go so far as to say that his wife has a malady in one of her breasts and the queen is only waiting for her to die to marry Lord Robert.' "<sup>82</sup>

Leicester is a fundamental piece if we want to understand the puzzle that Elizabeth's life was. Everything that Elizabeth did would have probably been different without Dudley, if she were a drug addict he would have been her daily dose – the decisions she took regarding England's future do tell us that she placed her responsibilities above her private life. But Leicester's mission was even more significant. Elizabeth claimed him as her own private volcano in an atmosphere as gelid as the arctic, he was her sweet sin. She used him to satisfy her biological urges hence keeping her sane, providing her sufficient tranquillity to affront her daily business.

Whether Gloriana was virgin or not she is known today as the Virgin Queen, constructing these mythical narratives around influential characters is as important as cunning diplomatic strategies or efficient soldiers. This notion was used to present her as pristine as it gets to combat the Catholic idea that she represented an hellish creature that had to be removed. One myth that I want to dispel is the one that absolute monarchs rule alone: "All successful political leaders in history, from Julius Caesar to Napoleon, have based their success on believing themselves to be in touch with the *people*, and this Elizabeth did with extraordinary panache from the very beginning."<sup>83</sup> She was able to enamor enough of the mundane universe that surrounded her; the widespread notion that her wedlock was with England fortified her power base thus reinforcing her right to govern. The prevalent state of mind, at least south of the Trent, was one which saw a defiant monarch, one that was not going to sellout to foreigners.

Circumstances are a prerequisite to comprehend the strategic dilemmas faced by anyone. This is so because we are always inscribed in a specific epoch and in a precise geographical space. I shall illustrate this by contrasting the cases of Edward and

---

<sup>82</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 129

<sup>83</sup> Wilson, A.N.. *The Elizabethans* (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 40

Elizabeth with that of Mary. Catherine of Aragon had married Henry VIII to build an alliance, this was the highest type of bond that could be engendered, by marrying another country you were supposed to establish a network that would tackle the problems faced by both crowns. Mary's somber reputation occurred for she was seen as partially foreigner, defending interests that seemed to be opposite to those of the English people. The decisions taken by our parents are one archetypical example of how we can be heavily influenced by things we haven't decided – Henry's cupidity, or innovative ruling if you prefer, permitted both Edward VI and Elizabeth I to be unchained from foreign powers, in a way the first queen regnant wasn't. Good Queen Bess was able to develop a strategy unhindered by external powers because both her parents were English, she had no connections to outsiders and this laid the ground for her attachment to Albion only. The reason why the reformation was accelerated during little Edward's reign was not a coincidence; he too wasn't bound to other realms because of his mother, just like Elizabeth.

Symbolism is an eternal feature that should never be downplayed; the visual aspect communicates with all humans in a way that words do not, a symbol can contain an history, a tale, an ideal. A common example is the swastika, a symbol oftentimes associated with Nazism, most specially in Europe. The swastika has however a very long history that predates Nazism but since the Third Reich it lost its heterogeneous identity and has been confined to Hitler's regime. The link between the queen of England and virginity was one that pointed out her purity and rectitude, a construction that was sustained by her aficionados: "...The jewels presented to the Queen by courtiers, especially the jewels given as New Year gifts, reflected the classical origins of her cult – a miniature by Nicholas Hilliard shows her wearing a jewelled crescent moon in her hair, to show her as Diana the Virgin Huntress..."<sup>84</sup> It wasn't uncommon to connect ruler's lineages with Greco-Roman deities – to firmly state one's competence and sacred force.

I said elsewhere that one of the most striking features Elizabeth possessed was her Conservatism, not for a moment was she willing to abandon solid ground for shifting sands. Her bizarre childhood and teenage years induced in her a sense of awareness that

---

<sup>84</sup> Wilson, A.N.. The Elizabethans (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 35

was not commonly observed among her peers, let alone those of the female sex. She knew that human actions develop results that are unpredictable before the process reaches its terminus. For such reason she was never convinced that the Protestants had all the same objectives like her master of the horse or her spymaster. This skepticism was immensely important for it stopped the entrance of undesired factions into her devastated kingdom. The Dutch or French refugees that she received had a difficult choice to make: they would be asked to desert their old beliefs and fuse themselves into their novel state. This requirement guaranteed the necessary homogeneity for the loyalty to the queen's cause and not to their old masters' one. Her refusal to blend into the larger Protestant struggle permitted her to sustain her state's uniformity and prevent baleful enclaves inside her territory: "In order to oppose his neighbours, the Emperor of Constantinople brought ten thousand Turkish troops into Greece: when the war was over they did not want to leave, and this was the beginning of Greek servitude under the infidel."<sup>85</sup> Elizabeth knew the ruinous effects that relying on mercenary or auxiliary troops entailed. Her acute and informed mind discerned that she wasn't relinquishing Catholicism in order to formulate a new loose ecclesiastical structure that could easily overpower her regal law – she knew that a Protestant kingdom, in a Calvinist or Lutheran sense, was too radical and unstable for her taste.

Elizabeth's strategy was a risky one. She needed strong Protestant forces pinning down Charles IX and Philip II but she didn't want to be influenced by those forces. This constant state of convergence followed by divergence might seem extremely erratic, but the art of ruling is shrouded by intense contrasts and perpetual adjustments. One could argue that she didn't recur to external soldiers because she had no money to match their tariffs but this seems to me an insufficient response. If we analyze carefully the geopolitical situation we see that she could have resorted to them, especially the Dutch. Holland was under heavy fire and desperation leads to bad choices, which she could have tried to exploit. Elizabeth Tudor had a profoundly ambiguous image, that resisted into our days, she was the hero of all Protestants but she disliked most them, she was the nemesis of all Catholics but in many ways admired their grandeur. A queen that learned prudence with Somerset and *joie de vivre* with Leicester. Her gauche behaviour produced unexpected results.

---

<sup>85</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 47

## 4 - The Grand Finale

### 4.1 - By all means necessary

Elizabeth's government was alarmed with Parma's success in the Low Countries and hoped he wouldn't be able to conquer Antwerp – which had been the commercial hub of northwestern Europe since the beginning of the XVI century. The king of Spain seemed to be recovering from the blows he had suffered in the past and the queen of England knew she had to react:

"His brilliant admiral, the Marquis of Santa Cruz, annihilated any Portuguese resistance in the Azores, crushing forces loyal to Antonio in July 1582. At the same time, Alba's troops in Portugal solidified Philip's stranglehold on his new dominion. In the Low Countries, the Duke of Parma's vicious campaign against the Dutch insurgents went on unabated, despite Elizabeth's support for Anjou's puppet government. In 1583, Parma retook Nieuwpoort and Dunkirk on the North Sea, establishing his Spanish naval squadron there as a bridgehead to an invasion of England."<sup>86</sup>

I do believe the notables in London thought France was going to intervene in a way or another to curb Spanish momentum, that was why they thought Antwerp would be able to remain independent. Walsingham was perhaps the one less optimistic regarding the situation in the Low Countries, he knew how France was unreliable and he rightly assumed Paris would prefer to deal with a Spanish controlled Antwerp that remained within the Catholic sphere of influence than to deprive the Spanish of their conquest and have to deal with a Calvinist stronghold. The French were once again opting for a grand strategy which would permit the annexation of some territories along France's northern border. It is indeed true that they failed to rise as high as Antwerp but a very important port like Dunkirk is now part of the French state. Strategically speaking Parma had Antwerp cornered, he had reconquered Overijssel, Drenthe and Groningen for the Spanish crown and most of the County of Flanders and the Duchy of Brabant. Practically this had three consequences. Firstly it was impossible for Antwerp to receive the aid of a relief force coming from the Holy Roman Empire as Parma had an adamant

---

<sup>86</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 260-261

cordon from Groningen to Overijssel. The second advantage was the possibility to receive supplies or men in the two ports he now controlled, this would permit him to rely on a route other than the Spanish road, increasing his flexibility substantially and thus reducing his vulnerabilities so far away from home. His presence in Flanders and Brabant reassured him that the French would have a hard time penetrating into those territories if suddenly they had a change of heart.

The perilous situation England was embroiled in will shed light once again that rulers follow the *raison d'état* and sometimes this requires to accept blunt contradictions: "Though she never openly admitted that they were right, Elizabeth would agree by the autumn of 1584 to give financial and military assistance to the Dutch rebels. The top priority was to try to save Antwerp from extermination at the hands of Parma. And with Parma now in charge of two Low Countries' ports, capable of making rendezvous with a larger invasion force from Spain, Walsingham's spy network clicked into high gear."<sup>87</sup> The Presbyterian movement commenced by John Knox in Scotland and the Puritan dissenters inside or outside the Church of England were inspired by Calvin's doctrine, yet as Elizabeth repressed such disruptive forces inside her kingdom she was aiding their spiritual brothers fighting off the Spaniards. This is a very intelligent strategy, the policies we promote within our domains do not have to be the same that we promote around the rest of the globe, Léon Gambetta's posture stating that anticlericalism was not an article to export is revealing enough of how leaders must analyze each case separately and not define one enlightened procedure for all situations.

Parma's siege erected a bunch of assailing posts around Antwerp just like a carpenter creates wooden structures around an empty living room, encircling the empty space. The inhabitants of Antwerp didn't have an advantage that besieged citizens usually do, the Spaniards knew their territory just as good as they did. This is a crucial element if we want to comprehend Antwerp's fragilities. It is indeed true that the Antwerpians were natives but the Spaniards had been controlling the Low Countries since Charles V – there existed several maps which were incredibly detailed and the Spanish soldiers were used to fight in the murky environment, swamps and canals. Geography determines what operations can be pursued and those which are impossible to do; the

---

<sup>87</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 263

commander needs to fuse himself with the land and acquire an engaged visualization of the terrain, he should perceive how a mountain links with a river or how a plain collapses into a forest: "Among the other things necessary to a commander of armies is the knowledge of localities and countries, because without such general and particular knowledge, a commander of armies cannot undertake any action."<sup>88</sup> Here one should not assume that such knowledge is only acquired through maps, books and other objects related with sapience, he who leads must also explore the lands himself. It should be noted that a proper leader should seek to acquire knowledge through both theory and practice but if this is not possible due to circumstances and he has to decide between those two, practice is usually more illustrative than theory.

Antwerp resisted bravely but all the scenario conjured against her, she was able to resist for a bit more than one year, from July 1584 until August 17, 1585. Migrations are a fundamental aspect if we are to unlock the secrets which make some perish and others survive; Antwerp had been losing its flame ever since the episode of 1576 named the *Spanish Fury*. Such violent event marked many of the inhabitants and made them fearful of another similar attack, thus all those who embraced Calvinist ideas were gradually moving further north, to harsher lands but that kept them shielded from Spanish authority. Antwerp was London's redline and when she fell Elizabeth didn't ruminate for long, she comprehended the necessity to commit to a cause which she felt alienated from, even disgusted by: "Alarmed by the fall of Antwerp to the duke of Parma's army in August 1585, just before Drake had begun his voyage, Elizabeth had agreed to send to the Netherlands a force of more than six thousand infantry and one thousand cavalry to aid the embattled rebels. On October 1, 1585, she issued a twenty-page document to explain England's intervention in the Netherlands, stating it was justified because of Philip's complicity in the pope's invasion of Ireland, an English territory, and because of his repeated conspiracies to assassinate her. To command the English force Elizabeth appointed her favorite, Robert Dudley, earl of Leicester. He and his army set out across the channel on December 19, 1585."<sup>89</sup> The fall of Antwerp marks the decisive cut of the Low Countries, it marks the division of what would come to be known as two separate political units: Holland and Belgium. The drift of power northwards was not slowed or impaired, it accelerated drastically and Amsterdam was

---

<sup>88</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy* Book III (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 346

<sup>89</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 225

becoming what Antwerp had been. *Flandes* was the most disputed area between a wide variety of European grand powers; it isn't out of the blue that the European Union's capital is in Brussels, it was there that the future of Europe (and consequently the world) was played out – over and over again – between Hispanics, Gauls, Teutons and British.

The English public relations committee justified Dudley's presence in the Low Countries with considerable success. Once again London framed the war as a doctrinal one, while at the same time being well aware of the falsehood of that statement. Nevertheless this produced the desired result, it united the Protestant cause against the kings of Spain and France and the pope. Elizabeth Tudor was excusing her intervention in the Netherlands by pointing out that the Catholics kept destabilizing her rightful Ireland. She also mentioned the attempts on her life which had all failed, this had a double objective: building her enemies' ire and illuminating their incompetence. Gloriana knew that ire is a bad counselor so as her situation was descending into one where she could dither no longer it was imperative that her enemies were filled with vile emotions that clouded their good judgement. At the same time she ironically told all Europe that her enemies were so powerful but still they were unable to scar her; their tries had all been stopped in time, they could not hide their failures and faced an adroit challenger.

In order to grasp why Parma was just as competent as Alba on the battlefield but he was inferior in other aspects we must compare the two men. Alba was not innocuous when it came to politics, he knew how to work his ideas in political atmospheres and he had a very acute perception when it came to decide what came after a military victory. Parma was less tactful politically, he had been corrupted by humanism which rendered him incapable of applying the necessary potion to eliminate a noxious disease: "But the weakness of men in the present, caused by their poor education and their slight knowledge of affairs, makes them consider ancient punishments as partly inhumane and partly impossible."<sup>90</sup> Humanism is a concept closely related with Idealism and in opposition to Realism which is based on the Christian theology of the fall. The fall of Adam and Eve corrupted all humans and made them imperfect, giving them dark attributes. Humanism tends to downplay this reality which assumes that men are not

---

<sup>90</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book III* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 320

angels and quite often dismisses it altogether. Alexander Farnese considered the flaying of Antwerp to be too brutal and barbaric and this made him opt for a more moderate approach. Such approach isn't always incorrect, when fortune and the required circumstances demand it, but when they don't coincide as was the case in 1585 – after one year of siege – they will produce harmful effects. Fernando Álvarez de Toledo y Pimentel was not as sensible as Parma, he knew that grand achievements more often than not require violent acts and traumatic scenes. The Duke of Alba wasn't defiled by notions of love, tolerance and peace, he fully understood that men had to be civilized and controlled in order to prevent their bestiality and insolence. Sadly for Philip Alba had been old and worn out and he had spent his last years in Portugal, a place that required basically no persuasion from the Duke for the Portuguese were decently integrated in the Spanish Empire.

The fall of Antwerp describes perfectly the need to direct our attention to two mandatory strategic premises – internal insurgency and restrictive victories: "Clausewitz did not think Borodino a classic of strategy. In the whole battle he found 'not a single trace of an art or superior intelligence,' the result coming 'less from a carefully considered decision than from indecision and circumstance.' His initial, and not unreasonable, conclusion was that the 'vastness' of Russia made it impossible 'to cover and occupy strategically.' A 'large country of European civilization' could not 'be conquered without the help of internal discord.' Later he was harsher on Napoleon for not chasing the Russian army and described Borodino as a battle that was 'never completely fought out.' Both judgements had important implications: the first that the degree of popular support for the state made a difference when dealing with external threats; the second that a victory that did not leave the enemy fatally wounded was of limited value."<sup>91</sup> Parma had to face the same problems as Napoleon at Borodino, he had all the Calvinist and even Catholic rebels against him and was unable to subdue the Low Countries due to their fragmented nature. There are some similarities between England's impossibility to conquer Ireland properly and Spain's incapacity to dominate the Netherlands efficiently – their primitive decentralized structures saved them. The Benelux is far smaller than Russia, what leads me to assume that insurgents play a bigger role than territorial immensity when stabilizing a territory.

---

<sup>91</sup> Freedman, Lawrence. *Strategy: A History* (Oxford University Press, USA; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2013) page 82

## 4.2 - Dieu et mon droit

The last plot which is worth mentioning goes by the name of Babington plot. Just like the other two we've already went through this one also carries the name of the central element around which all the plot revolved. Francis Walsingham knew about this attempt to oust his queen since its very beginning and he decided to let it grow to acquire an irrevocable proof that Mary, Queen of Scots, desired Elizabeth's demise: "The Babington Plot was a real one, but what none of the conspirators realised was that Walsingham had known about it from the beginning, and that the consummate spy-master had decided to use it as a way of finally entrapping the Scottish queen. Letters had come in and out of Chartley concealed in beer barrels. They now had written proof that Mary was colluding with the would-be murderers of the Queen of England."<sup>92</sup> Once again Walsingham overwhelms us with his expertise and cunning, by not seizing the plotters immediately he was able to analyze their projects without letting them know Big Brother was watching them – just like a ghost that crosses from one room to another without being noticed, invisible and silent.

Anthony Babington had Catholic sympathies and he was one of those Englishmen which saw queen Elizabeth as a bastard, never forgiving Henry VIII for having married her mother and for having deserted Catherine of Aragon – the true queen for most Papists. Jesuit strengths had been diminished ever since the act against them had been passed in 1584 but their presence was not completely removed. As I've mentioned elsewhere such act curbed Catholic powers in England and this was mandatory in securing the country, however John Ballard was able to incite Babington to try a *coup d'état*. Ballard and Babington formulated a plan which would save Mary from captivity and would be followed by a Catholic invasion of England by the Guise and Spanish forces.

We should not forget that the Treaty of Nonsuch (10<sup>th</sup> of August, 1585) was the last straw which made the escalation of the Anglo-Spanish conflict unavoidable. Such treaty was signed a few days before the Fall of Antwerp and according to me it opens the Anglo-Spanish War which would outlast Elizabeth herself. Fortune did not favour

---

<sup>92</sup> Wilson, A.N.. The Elizabethans (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 231

Gloriana for I believe she signed it hoping to save Antwerp. The result was catastrophic, Antwerp would be conquered and England would have a proper alliance with the states of the United Provinces – something Spain could not tolerate. This should render us cognizant that there is a big difference between fighting an enemy in the dark or doing it in plain sunlight. Elizabeth's merchant adventurers had been molesting Hispanic domains and ships for a while, not only in the New World but also in Europe, and it wasn't a secret that she had been aiding the rebels in the Netherlands; still the Treaty of Nonsuch was nothing short of a declaration of war – Good Queen Bess could no longer claim exemption after a written document had been celebrated and everyone in London knew this which confirms that Antwerp was indeed a redline.

Humans are biologically determined to strive for domination over others, this means that we cannot blame neither the Spaniards for wanting to rule the world nor the English for wanting to stop them, this has always been the way things work and it is unlikely that it will ever change. This leads me to comment on claims which assert that there exist two camps, the camp of evil and the camp of goodness. I refute such idea because struggles are far more complex than that, at least most of them are. Yet we are obliged to frame wars in that fashion as we want to win and winning requires lies, convincing lies. Furthermore, when a state is in a complicated strategic positioning it will rapidly commence to justify its actions stating that a battle between darkness and light is going on: " ' There was a time when you thought so too, but now you calculate your own advantage and talk of right and wrong – a consideration which has never yet deterred anyone from using force to make a gain when opportunity presents' "<sup>93</sup> This should be revealing enough that what creates peace is the balance of power or in the present nuclear weapons. There should be absolutely no doubt that what transformed our world in a more peaceful place comparing it with previous centuries is the possibility of destroying everything with weapons that are incredibly powerful. But in the XVI century there existed no such weapons so biology promoted a very pernicious constancy which asphyxiated many other aspects of life. We should bear in mind that analyses considering right and wrong open an eternal debate; right according to whom? to the laws of men or to the laws of god? Right, but where? In Spain? In England? In Persia? In China? A debate considering such topic is very interesting and stimulating but this is

---

<sup>93</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 38

a question which disembarks us in the realm of philosophy or religion and this is a political work, in politics might makes right.

Biology not only hatches belligerent societies, it also imbues in humans the need to search for a condition which gives them a sense of belonging. This quest for intimacy can be fulfilled by forging a bond with either a Nation-State, an ethnic group or a religious society. The English queen defied everyone and everything, she embodies the monarchy's motto like no other monarch ever did – *Dieu et mon droit*. Such motto can have several interpretations, let me present you with mine. I hold the credo that such phrase is about sovereignty, a cry against submission and apathy, the heart which pumps blood through the veins of the English Nation-State. Elizabeth inherited her father's vision. England would not bow. Gloriana opted for a strategy which imitated the French system of *une alliance de revers*. She sought to establish solid relations with Orthodox Russians and Muslim Turks – this wasn't her biggest success but the willingness to do it proves that she was not intimidated with possible consequences. England sought to protect her fragile independence and in order to do so I shall expose how she enrolled her sons into her service, satiating their need to belong:

"It is certainly necessary, if one wishes penalties for evil deeds to be upheld, to provide rewards for good ones, as we see was done in Rome. Although a republic may be poor and may give very little, it should not hold back from giving that small amount, because every little gift bestowed upon anyone as a reward for doing something good, no matter how great, will always be esteemed by the receiver as honourable and extremely grand."<sup>94</sup>

One is rapidly convinced of the efficiency of giving men titles, for titles are very honourable and they cost the treasury absolutely nothing. This Elizabeth did with grand awareness, knowing she was bestowing upon her subjects – like Drake or Hawkins – an immense reason to fight for her, to die for her. Machiavelli learns us that we should have a balanced approach, in fact Machiavelli is far less Machiavellian than most think. The importance of the dichotomy between penalising evildoers and rewarding laudable servants is a lesson that all princes should follow. A state should shame the wicked and

---

<sup>94</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. Discourses on Livy Book I (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 79

praise the guardians of its own perpetuity. English statecraft was even doing something else, it was telling private investors that they could gain their own share if they sided with the government, trampling its adversaries. When coffers are empty and there are necessities to be met one must explore the wild and extract value wherever one finds it, England found her way to fame and fortune through destruction and lawlessness, we often perceive this as something shameful but if we are a bit more cautious we will understand that such is the way things operate. Another fact that we cannot overlook is that as there are eternal truths – like that the state's primal concern is that of surviving – there are variations too. In the aforementioned citation Machiavelli describes Rome which was entirely different from XVI century England, we must respect the specificity of each epoch in order to unveil its strategic anguishes. Two brief examples will demonstrate this. The first is that during Roman times power was way less fragmented than in the sixteenth century which changes the relations of force considerably. The second is that during Gloriana's reign the Atlantic had a far more important role than what the Romans could have ever dreamt of.

When the Babington Plot was convincingly put to rest Walsingham used the letters Mary had written to incriminate her beyond salvation. The private play which featured Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart as the two main actresses was finally reaching its conclusion, Mary's role had been very promising when she was young but as time wore on she faced too many obstacles and was unable to rise to the expectations her infancy had crafted; Elizabeth had gone through the reverse process, her childhood was full of problems but as time passed she improved her position like very few thought she would. And it wasn't due to Mary's decapitation that Spain conceived the Enterprise of England, that had already been decided – at least in Philip's mind – after the Treaty of Nonsuch and the Fall of Antwerp: "At a little past eight on the morning of Wednesday, February 8, 1587, Mary Queen of Scots was beheaded in the great hall of Fotheringhay castle, her last words, spoken in Latin, being those of Christ's final utterance upon the cross, *'In manus tuas, Domine, confide spiritum meum'* – Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit."<sup>95</sup> The Queen of Scots' execution produces a new question, shouldn't it have happened sooner? The response I will give will point out the difference between rapidity and slowness. Elizabeth's maturity and that of the English state

---

<sup>95</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 229

increased substantially because they harnessed knowledge as they experienced different troubles. Mary's presence in England was heinous and strategically speaking it had been a better option to remove her quick. The risk of not acting rapidly was that she started being seen as a rallying point against the incumbent queen, just like Elizabeth had been when her half-sister held the throne. The delay in executing the Queen of Scots provided England with various political channels that might have been closed if she had snatched her opponent's life sooner. As we are able to grasp, there existed positive and negative aspects on both approaches. Charlatans often advise against taking someone's life for in their assumption that just means the prince wasn't able to render useless a sole enemy but this advise is pathetic for as it is indeed true that Mary Stuart did not replace Elizabeth Tudor it is also true that the latter did substitute Bloody Mary:

"But if some citizen in the course of their deliberations advised that Arezzo be destroyed, those who seemed to be wiser declared that would bring little honour upon the city, since it would appear that Florence lacked the strength to hold it. These arguments are of the kind that appear to be true but are not, because by this same reasoning one would never execute a traitor or a wicked and seditious man, since to do so would shamefully demonstrate that the ruler lacked the power to restrain a single individual. Those men who hold such opinions fail to see that men taken individually, and a city as a whole, sometimes sin against the state in such a way that in order to make an example to others for one's own security, a ruler has no other remedy than to destroy them. Honour consists in being able and knowing how to punish them, not in being able to hold them amidst a thousand dangers, because a ruler who does not punish a man who errs in such a way that he cannot err again is held to be either ignorant or cowardly."<sup>96</sup>

Mary Stuart sinned against her cousin oftentimes because not only men are doomed to battle for supremacy, women fall into competitive pits just as often as men do. A prudent leader must adopt an hybrid *modus operandi* which consents that angelism is the first foe; purity, if it is real, is something not of this world hence he must extirpate heresy, preferably when dissent is still small and limited.

---

<sup>96</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. Discourses on Livy Book II (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 218

### 4.3 - The Protestant Wind

The Enterprise of England was conceived with a very special mission, that of returning England to the old faith. In order to comprehend why Philip was able to start this process we must remember two fundamental aspects. The first was that after Lepanto his most worrisome foe had been decisively enfeebled. After 1571 the Spanish Empire gave more attention to the Low Countries which before such date had enjoyed less troubles due to the Mediterranean dispute. The Dutch were so happy with Turkish power that they even made a slogan that contained the following phrase: 'Liever Turks dan Paaps' meaning 'Rather Turkish than Papist'. We should never forget that the Ottoman Empire was astonishingly powerful in the XVI century and not the sick man of Europe that it would become centuries later. Before Lepanto the Turk had been siphoning most of the resources the king of Spain had.

The second crux was English intromission in the Netherlands aiding the rebels and piracy against the Spanish crown. With the Ottomans out of the way it was imperative that Philip tried to subdue his northern subjects and this was only going to be possible if England stopped stealing his precious colonial cargo and if she ceased her help to the Sea Beggars. Parma's success in *Flandes* reinforced Philip's awareness that something had to be done to neutralize English aggression.

The Spanish operation consisted in having the Armada, that would depart from Lisbon, joining hands with Parma's squadron that would be waiting and ready to cross the channel along the Spanish controlled areas of the Low Countries. This plan required a degree of communication that just wasn't available during the XVI century. How could the armada contact Parma properly and how would he respond efficiently? This was the first problem the Spaniards would not be able to overcome. If the armada and Parma were able to link then they would have to cross the strait of Dover and disembark Parma's frightening army on English soil but this would be hard to achieve. The Dutch would be on guard and would try to stop Parma's troops from embarking and assuming they would be able to do so it was going to be tough to cross the tiny strait as English warships would create a blockade.

The English plan started with a savant advice from Drake which wanted to control Spanish movements as soon as they reached the English channel: "So it was that after considering the lengthy argument made by Drake, who was then admiral of the section of Elizabeth's fleet based in the west of England, Howard agreed to move the navy's main base of operations from Greenwich and the mouth of the Thames to Plymouth, near the western entrance of the channel. Drake had argued that Philip would very likely send a substantial fleet to protect Parma's army as it attempted to cross the channel in the area of Dover, since Parma's crossing would be nearly impossible without a protective escort to ward off English warships."<sup>97</sup> Sir Francis Drake opted for a strategy that made England stand her ground as soon as the Spaniards arrived near her home, this had two consequences: the first was that Elizabeth's navy was going to make a stand away from London, letting the invaders know that all the south was on high alert. The second was that the English were opting for a strategy which exposed their vessels considerably and this might have proved to be fatal if Spain had had a more competent admiral.

As a defensive force her majesty's navy was going to pursue a tactic which sought to unravel Philip's master plan, the English had no specific objective to reach, they would respond to whatever the attacker did, their sole objective was that of rendering the invasion of their island impossible:

"The endeavour to destroy the enemy's force has a positive object, and leads to positive results, of which the final aim is the conquest of the enemy. The preservation of our own forces has a negative object, leads therefore to the defeat of the enemy's intentions, that is to pure resistance, of which the final aim can be nothing more than to prolong the duration of the contest, so that the enemy shall exhaust himself in it."<sup>98</sup>

Before the armada departed from Lisbon the unthinkable had happened, the marquis of Santa Cruz died (February 9, 1588). This was a bad omen. Álvaro de Bazán was the most capable commander of his generation when it came to maritime operations just like Alba regarding terrestrial ones. Fortune did not favour the Spaniards, it is clear to

---

<sup>97</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 247

<sup>98</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 25

all that Bazán would have created far more problems to English defenses than what his replacement did.

The man Philip appointed to replace Santa Cruz was Medina Sidonia. The chosen one was a very titled and wealthy Spaniard but he was certainly not a great military leader and he tried, more than once, to tell Philip that he saw the enterprise as a very risky venture. The Spanish king would have none of it, he mentioned that Sidonia was the right man for the job for being the rank he was he was obviously god's choice. This was not uncommon during the sixteenth century, keep in mind that the official leader of the English navy was also picked because of his blood. Yet Charles Howard was aware that he should delegate major responsibilities to those which were more apt than him, Medina Sidonia didn't want to go in the first place but once there he was intransigent.

When the *Grande y Felicísima Armada* arrived at the channel's entrance near Plymouth the men in charge had their first disagreement. Juan Martínez de Recalde told Zúñiga that the English were stuck in Plymouth harbour due to the currents and wind and they should seize that opportunity to block their exit and pound them hard. Zúñiga's inexperience and pride made him ignore Recalde's good advice, he might have not wanted to come but since he was there he was not going to let his inferiors boss him around, he was following the king's orders which told him to go straight for Parma. While Effingham was simply *primus inter pares* Sidonia wanted to be more than that. We can only speculate what actually made the Spanish commander behave as he did but I sincerely believe it was a mixture of his military inexperience and a heavy conscience which prohibited a change of course for one could not disobey his sovereign: "And last of all, men, vehemently in love with their own new opinions (though never so absurd,) and obstinately bent to maintain them, gave those their opinions also that revered name of Conscience, as if they would have it seem unlawful, to change or speak against them; and so pretend to know they are true, when they know at most but that they think so."<sup>99</sup> Medina Sidonia's incompetence is a postulate which damaged the armada's flexibility, as the armada went east it had some minor skirmishes with the English fleet and once again the command was not the most adequate. The incursions the royal navy did between Weymouth and the Isle of Wight were able to show its home advantage;

---

<sup>99</sup> Hobbes, Thomas. *The Leviathan* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 26

the Spaniards were less familiarized with the shallow waters near the English coast. Drake had been leading the operations but he counted on competent partners like Frobisher and Hawkins. Gloriana's seadogs were playing a lethal game, they had to go for the Spanish ships but at the same time they knew that if they slid into grappling range all could be lost – finding the perfect spot between inefficiency and destruction was an activity only able to be fulfilled by extremely experienced corsairs.

As the invincible Armada (a name given to it by those who saw it) progressed eastwards it was becoming closer to Farnesio's army and this worried the English that had only been able to neutralize 2 Spanish ships of the 125 which Sidonia led. Zúñiga had finally received news from Parma when he was anchored at Calais which said his forces were not prepared to embark. Obviously the English knew not of such calamity and had to act as fast as possible to prevent the link between the two forces: "While Medina Sidonia was trying to decide what to do next, Lord Admiral Howard and his fellow admirals were planning action of their own. On the morning of August 7, they held a council of war aboard the *Ark Royal* and, fearful that Medina Sidonia and Parma were about to link up, decided to assault the anchored Spanish fleet with fireships that night, before the rendezvous could be effected."<sup>100</sup> The decision to use fireships is a vehement reminder that old tactics shouldn't be looked down upon, depending on the situation one encounters one should always be open to try things that might seem archaic for they can produce positive effects – they will certainly surprise the enemy and catch it off guard. The eight burning ships thrown against the Spaniards produced what the English admirals had hoped, a disarray which they would try to exploit: "The *San Martin* raised anchor and sailed out to sea for a mile, but most of the Spanish captains lacked Sidonia's sangfroid. Many cut their cables. The fire-ships had not managed to set a single Spanish ship ablaze, but they had broken the order of battle that Sidonia had maintained unflinchingly all the way up the Channel. Without their primary anchors, these ships were going to suffer dearly in the weeks ahead. Many were now rudderless."<sup>101</sup> Notwithstanding the disorder which indeed broke the armada's tight formation the English were unable to perform as good as they would have liked because their gunpowder was running short. Relying on their rapid fire and maneuverability the English soon understood that even if they had a fire rate superior to their enemies it also

---

<sup>100</sup> Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King* (St Martin's Press, 2013) page 290-291

<sup>101</sup> Wilson, A.N.. *The Elizabethans* (Cornerstone Digital, 2001) page 254

meant that they would need more gunpowder which an impoverished queen could not provide. The Battle of Gravelines proved to be indecisive but it seemed like the protestant wind would finish the royal navy's job by making the Spanish ships crash on the tricky shoals. This did not occur because the wind shifted and the Spaniards were able to avoid their destruction by steering their armada northwards into the Germanic Sea. Despite the peril faced Recalde wanted to go back and try to get Parma and give the invasion another go but once again his words were ignored. The English had disengaged the armada for the weather was deteriorating itself further and their ammo was ending. Sidonia's sense of duty had been changed by a strong desire to remain alive and he decided a return to Spain that would happen by circumnavigating Scotland and Ireland (probably to avoid the English) which would prove deadly to many Spanish vessels. The human cost was immense on both sides but England had survived, 1588 was so important forging English national character not because England became the number one power, that would only happen in the XVIII century but due to the fact that the tiny nation had managed to subsist against all odds.

We can conclude this phase by pointing out why the invasion failed. A poor commander, dramatic weather, an intricate operation and English competence undid Philip's campaign. A prince should learn to choose the ablest, grab the chances fortune allows and opt for simplicity over complexity. Besides all this what 1588 teaches us all is that wars are won by warriors and not by riches:

"Basing their actions upon this maxim, they believe that it is sufficient to have a great deal of money to defend themselves, and they do not consider the fact that if money were sufficient to produce victory, then Darius would have defeated Alexander, the Greeks would have defeated the Romans, and in our times, Duke Charles would have defeated the Swiss and, just a few days ago, the pope and the Florentines together would have had no difficulty in defeating Francesco Urbino. But all those mentioned above were defeated by those who believed that good soldiers, not money, are the sinew of warfare."<sup>102</sup>

Wealth is not the sinew of warfare, if it were, England would have been conquered.

---

<sup>102</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book II* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 178

## 4.4 - The Successor

1588 marked the peak of the tension between London and Madrid; after the *Enterprise of England* both crowns reversed to the type of conflict they had been engaged in before. This was a cooldown phase which both nations relished upon. Elizabeth's resources were more thin than ever but she knew Spain still loomed along the horizon so she would provide even more liberty to her gentlemen adventurers. Although Gloriana had no other choice than to rely on private groups to do the state's job and she was able to fuse both objectives during most of her reign this commenced to be seen as a serious problem. The pirates were indeed covetous and their lust for riches enfeebled the pursuit of the objectives laid down by the state. Strategically speaking she had no other option, her governing structure was not strong enough to operate alone which promoted liberty but at the same time rendered the English polity incapable of rising up decisively against its foes. Such fragilities would plunge England into chaos during the XVII century and it was only after the Glorious Revolution and most specifically during the Hanoverian epoch that Britain (and not England) would become the most powerful nation in the world.

We can't be sure if Elizabeth read the works of Machiavelli but I am inclined to say that it wouldn't be absurd to suggest it; it seems to me that she certainly felt, like her father, that she had been called by fate to establish a new order – to be a legislator: "Anyone who reads the Bible intelligently will see that, in order to advance his laws and his institutions, Moses was forced to kill countless men, who were moved to oppose his plans by nothing more than envy."<sup>103</sup> Elizabeth Tudor agreed with this notion of reading the Bible intelligently, as a direct source without the need of the Roman Catholic Church as an intermediary – she imagined herself as Moses causing mayhem and confusion but at the same time opposing many enemies which envied her glory and wanted to remove her from the international scene. Philip launched other projects and built more vessels to try another invasion but his plans were foiled by the weather, a tired population and a lack of conviction which was even stronger now than it had been during the time of Medina Sidonia.

---

<sup>103</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy* Book III (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 326

Throughout the 1590s Ireland continued to be a nightmarish liability. Before American expansionism towards the Pacific during the XIX century – as they fulfilled their manifest destiny – there had already been a confront with the Wild West, that's the best definition I can come up with to describe Hibernia. The only safe area for English settlers was the Pale as I've mentioned elsewhere. Notwithstanding such reality England continued to engage on explorations and settlements on other areas, most notably around the south of the Island such as the Earldoms of Desmond and Ormond and Wexford which had produced some sort of syncretism of Irish and English culture. But still, beyond the Pale English authority was at best weak at worst imaginary. We are then obliged to mention once again the Germanic continuity that had spurred from the ashes of Northumbria and made England and Scotland (southern part) share more mores than those they did with a primarily Celtic Ireland:

"But when dominions are acquired in a region that is not similar in language, customs, and institutions, it is here that difficulties arise; and it is here that one needs much good luck and much diligence to hold on to them. One of the best and most efficacious remedies would be for the person who has taken possession of them to go there to live. This would make that possession more secure and durable; as happened with the Turk in Greece; for despite all the other methods he employed to retain that dominion, if he had not gone to live there it would have been impossible for him to hold on to it. By being on the spot, troubles are seen at their birth and be quickly remedied; not being there, they are heard about after they have grown up and there is no longer any remedy."<sup>104</sup>

We are then stunned with an amazing convergence of facts that helped England taking over Scotland. The three crucial overlaps are as follows: Edinburgh and London had deserted Rome ecclesiastically, had Germanic tongues that had been heavily influenced by French and France was the number one danger when Elizabeth became queen. If we compare England with Ireland we see that one joined the reformation but the other did not, one had a Germanic language while the other had a Celtic one and no English challenger controlled the Irish as the French controlled the Scots. Hence we must observe that fortune favoured Albion on this occasion albeit we must also point out that

---

<sup>104</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince* (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed.,2008) page 9

such favouring wouldn't have sufficed if England hadn't had a competent ruler that seized the opportunity. Great Britain would finally subdue Ireland properly during the XVIII century and her control over the territory would last until the beginning of the XX century.

Elizabethan strategies exhausted the Spaniards and this neoteric audacity from London rendered Paris even stronger. Good Queen Bess gave Holland her independence but was unable to transform France in a Protestant nation. Philip lost control over the northern provinces of the Spanish Netherlands and aided France retain her Catholic essence. It becomes noticeable that France gained from English efforts to undermine Spain but still was able to use Spanish funds to destroy its Huguenot rivals – consolidating the monarch's power. By frustrating Protestantism and Habsburg domination France was the real winner during the second half of the sixteenth century. Henry IV of France could only actually stop the French civil war and become her king by abjuring Calvinism and embracing Roman Catholicism – the eldest daughter of the Church would never tolerate a Protestant sovereign, it would be like having Lucifer presiding over Heaven. Henry's conversion was a bitter blow to Elizabeth it made her realize (once again) that there existed forces far more powerful than hers.

France was able to be stabilized but Henry IV had a heart of gold and wanted to appease tensions by granting the Protestants of his kingdom special rights which he did with the Edict of Nantes (1598). Little did he know that his successor would have to hunt down the Protestants to prevent a secession *à la hollandaise*, fortunately Louis XIII counted on one of the best political strategists ever – Cardinal Richelieu – and his decisions would not only consolidate French homogeneity which is a necessity to promote equality and protect an *art de vivre* but they would also render France the most powerful nation in Europe. This is easily understood if we comprehend the two meanings Hobbes gives to the State of Nature:

"Out Of Civil States, There Is Always Warre Of Every One Against Every One 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 Warre; and such a warre, as is of every man, against every man."<sup>105</sup>

The first meaning is the most literal one, Hobbes clearly mentions the times when humans did not have a proper state and lived in tribal, or even more primitive social structures. The second meaning is deeper and you need to read between the lines in order to fully grasp it; there Hobbes mentions the absence of a common law within a territory whether this law is republican or monarchical. Interest groups alienated from the common good which have their own agenda that is different from that of the state – De Gaulle would call them *les féodaux* as a reference to the feudal system of the Middle Ages. The Protestants that inhabited La Rochelle ceased to have a common identity with their fellow brothers and so wanted to create a different story, one that endangered French territorial integrity, this is what Hobbes speaks about, without the common power to watch over everything there ensues disorder and lawlessness mirroring the state of nature.

Nothing lasts forever and the Britannic trinity was vanishing, tired but pleased, after an eclectic life it was time to surrender to the eternal rest. The first to go was Sir Francis Walsingham, he died in 1590 surrounded by his family in the comfort of his home. The administrator, planner, devotee and spymaster that he was had given Elizabeth a fundamental sustenance to emancipate her island. His long-term vision mixed with his temporal awareness made him be one of Gloriana's boxing gloves. The other glove was Sir Francis Drake that succumbed six years after Walsingham: "Two months later, in January 1596, Drake had his stool shot out from under him while eating dinner. But his luck would not hold this time. Within weeks, he was dead of the bloody flux, probably brought on by an infection of his wounds."<sup>106</sup> Unlike the mischievous warlock the mughal of all pirates died far away from home in the West Indies fighting the Spaniards. Spanish fortifications had been ameliorated and El Draco was older and less perceptive but above all else his raids were under the law of diminishing returns. His surprise attacks were then no longer something novel and their initial impact of horror and panic had been replaced by habit and stiffness.

---

<sup>105</sup> Hobbes, Thomas. *The Leviathan* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 56

<sup>106</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 335

Whether it was Henry IV that said it or some of his contemporaries Paris was well worth a mass indeed. Arguably the city which carries more weight in European power politics since the Middle Ages. Whether heathen marauders during the Viking Age or Hitler's soldiers during World War II if you thought you were good you had to conquer her. London might not worth a mass yet but as the last Tudor monarch faded away the blueprint was laid for a kingdom that was bigger than England and was surely worth a mass: "In the gray hours of Thursday, March 24, 1603, Tudor England expired with Elizabeth. On her deathbed, too weak to talk, she communicated with her privy councillors by signs. They read out the names of her possible successors, and when the King of Scots's name was uttered, she slowly brought her hand to the crown of her head and nodded. James VI of Scotland, son of Mary Queen of Scots, would become James I of England. Having at last made her choice of successor official, Elizabeth Tudor allowed herself to slip away quietly."<sup>107</sup> By the Union of the Crowns Elizabeth was finishing her reign where she had commenced it – Scotland. She was preparing her people for battles that were yet to come and she knew England could not fend for herself alone. Her last decision as she laid dying was not less bold than others in her life; it would be ridiculous to say that England didn't have the primacy on the relationship with Scotland but it would be even more absurd to downplay Scottish attributes which fortified Great Britain as a giant.

William the Conqueror and Elizabeth Tudor were lawgivers just like Moses, Cyrus, Theseus and Romulus. The Norman was the maker of England and the Welsh was the crafter of Great Britain. They belonged to that narrow group of individuals that are larger than life. Gloriana's mission required the use of all methods, pure and impure, moral and immoral, veracious and false – she preferred to be good but when forced by necessity to enter evil she did it. The Armada Portrait says more than an infinite amount of ink ever could – the Spanish Armada arriving on the left zone of the portrait with a blinding light and as the armada crossed to the right zone of the portrait (passing through Elizabeth that is in the middle) it appears engulfed in a dark storm. Allegorically this means that even the most blessed enterprises that tried to challenge her rule would decay and wither. An incompetent prince has no purpose and is shaped by history, a competent prince has a telos and shapes history.

---

<sup>107</sup> Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009) page 368

## 5 - Conclusion

### 5.1 - Daughter of the Renaissance?

We've all heard the suggestion that the Renaissance marks a definitive change regarding politics and the art of governing. *In primis* we are told that the fall of Constantinople to the Turk allowed the escape of many byzantine scholars to Italy and this was fundamental in that supposed change. This is indeed true but Italy had been going through an intellectual rediscovery at least since the XIV century and it is unfair to pin all the process on the byzantine savants even if they brought a decent contribution. In order to clarify what changed and what remained the same this citation will help us:

"As I reflect upon how these affairs proceed, I conclude that the world has always been in the same state, and that although there has always been as much good as evil in it, this evil and this good vary from province to province; this can be seen from what we know of ancient kingdoms that differed from one another according to the variations in their customs, while the world remained as it always had been."<sup>108</sup>

The methods to wage war did change during the Renaissance but this isn't restricted to that period, it is very true that as time passes techniques are ameliorated and new tactics begin to be applied. We can also note a tendency to form real states as we know them today, most notably along Atlantic Europe – Portugal, Spain, France, England and Holland. Notwithstanding all this the main pillars sustaining the realist doctrine of International Relations stood as they had always been.

As history evolves through a dialectic movement new sapience is revealed and then it is used or not according to the capabilities the state has. Gloriana was indeed a daughter of the Renaissance regarding this historical movement, she participated in it very intensely. But as Machiavelli rightly reminds us the world remains the result of what the *rappports de force* produce, whether in the past, present or future. The medieval era wasn't as dark as many believe and more importantly, states already pursued their interests. Men acclimatize themselves to the epoch they inhabit.

---

<sup>108</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. Discourses on Livy Book II (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 150

*How effective is guerrilla warfare?* It was seen that guerrilla warfare can be a quite effective method to pester a stronger and more bureaucratic enemy. Contemporary jargon tends to call it asymmetric warfare, I believe that guerrilla warfare is a far more complete term. Guerrilla is the Spanish diminutive for war (*guerra*). Throughout the thesis we were able to observe that both the Irish and the Dutch acted as *guerrilleros* against more powerful foes as the English and the Spaniards. The positive part of guerrilla warfare can be summed up in two central points: primarily its fluidity and secondarily its low-budget workforce. The negative part can be resumed with other two points: its impossibility to form a real state and its high volatility. While being fluid can be very beneficial in the start it tends to get exhausting and it falls short of solidifying a true political unit. Its capacity to survive and operate with few resources is a great plus but its atypical structure sometimes provokes inner feuds like it was seen in the Irish and Dutch cases – an internal culling is more probable than in a steadier army due to the presence of different factions within its ranks. As a highly mobile force these warriors are able to exploit their enemies' faults more often than regular armies:

"But when opportunity presented, the first to take bold advantage of an enemy caught off guard relished this perfidious attack yet more than open reprisal: into his reckoning came both his own safety and the accolade he would also win for intelligence shown in achieving gain through bad faith. Most people would rather be called clever rogues than stupid saints, feeling shame at the latter and taking pride in the former."<sup>109</sup>

This is where these small units truly excel, their easier maneuverability can harass an antagonist constantly and answer lightly on their bad faith. For it is well known that armies that answer to a state can be far more corseted than those which answer to a dispersed political structure. I would like to conclude mentioning that guerrilla warfare's units can overcome their numerical inferiority and lack of organization by weakening their opponent's strengths – cut supply lines, destroy its ammo or try to assassinate their leaders. And it should be known that it is always easier to destroy than to construct or preserve, thence anomalous units have a lot less to lose than larger standing armies. Guerrilla warfare can be a very productive option sometimes.

---

<sup>109</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 171

*What role culture plays in international disputes?* Culture is what the individuals united through consent form after abandoning the state of nature. Different peoples form different cultures and culture not only permeates international disputes but also internal ones. Regardless the differences between all cultures they usually want to survive, the best way to do so is by having a strong state that protects such culture. Culture is the nidus of everything, when two cultures confront each other on the battlefield one might perish and this is known by those that engage in the combat. The difference between reform and decadence is often blurred and it is a very subjective matter; still in order to remain alive a culture has to reform itself in order to win the international disputes it faces – the hard part is reforming without losing its core essence, this Elizabeth Tudor did with extreme aptitude:

"Anyone who desires or tries to reform the government of a city in a way that is acceptable and capable of maintaining it to everyone's satisfaction will find it necessary to retain at least the semblance of its ancient customs, so that it will not seem to the people that its institutions have changed, though in fact the new institutions may be completely dissimilar from those of the past, because men in general live as much by appearances as by realities: indeed, they are often moved more by things as they appear than by things as they really are."<sup>110</sup>

Following her father's footsteps she was able to concentrate on the monarch both regal and ecclesiastical offices. This had been unseen before – at least inside Christendom – Caesaropapism had been used in the Byzantine Empire and was now used in its successor, as Moscow continued Constantinople's work. The Roman Catholic countries continued their battle with the papacy with mixed results. The Calvinists had embraced a puritan view of the world that would propagate the idea of a *City upon a hill* way beyond the Netherlands or Scotland. Calvinists would overpower governments and install their own conception of life. The Lutherans had emerged into a sort of neo-paganism which was intimately connected with the concept of Germanic folk and its traditions. Analyzing different cultures might help us understand how their states will react, it is now in vogue a comparison between Russia's Czarism linked with expansionism and China's Confucianism linked with pacifism.

---

<sup>110</sup> Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy Book I* (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009) page 80

*How important is propaganda?* Propaganda is highly necessary in order to prevent dissention from spawning and sustain the powers that be. We could affirm, without being considered madmen, that public relations and propaganda are twins. It is often noted by so called experts that propaganda is a tool only used by totalitarian regimes but this is far from the truth, two examples will suffice. The American invasion of Iraq in 2003 was highly debated in US media but dissenting voices were few and rapidly tagged of unpatriotic or misinformed – we see that on this aspect little has changed since Thucydides' time. The Treaty of Maastricht, that laid the foundation of federal Europe as some rightly pointed out in France, was not a process widely debated in most countries that accepted it, there were only three referendums – in France, Denmark and Ireland. Denmark rejected the treaty and was able to negotiate opt-outs, such as the one regarding the common currency, and accepted it later. The Irish accepted the treaty with circa 70% yes votes. The French also accepted it but with a tiny margin circa 51% yes votes. Besides these three nations all others didn't hold referendums, opting to tell their peoples that the outcome would be so good that they shouldn't even debate it. But if I had to define propaganda in a phrase I would pick the following one: propaganda is the art of tuning into the right vibration at the right time:

"In this time of trouble, as tends to happen, they recalled a verse which the old men said was being chanted long ago: 'A Dorian war will come, and bring a pestilence with it.' People had disputed whether the original word in the verse was *limos* ('famine') rather than *loimos* ('pestilence'): but not surprisingly in the present situation the prevailing view was that 'pestilence' was the word used. Men accommodate their memories to their current experience. I imagine that if at some time another 'Dorian war' comes after this one, with famine coinciding, the verse will in all likelihood be recited with that meaning."<sup>111</sup>

Always dependent on the situation propaganda has to mold itself according to what the winds of fortune dictate, the art required to render a narrative plausible is one which demands immensely talented spin doctors. Propaganda should always be a double-edged blade, it has to sanctify one's own cause and demonize the enemy. Those that only attack the enemy are fools, likewise for those that only protect themselves.

---

<sup>111</sup> Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009) page 99

*Geography is unchangeable, how crucial is it for a prince's strategy?* It is of the utmost importance. All states are limited to a specific terrain, therefore it is obvious that they must deal with it. Any princely strategy must have geography as the main variable. This is veritable not only when dealing with foreign powers but also inside one's own territory. Gloriana was able to propagate her power because she comprehended geography. The way she manipulated her foes was impressive due to the geostrategy she pursued. Maps have a soul of their own and they are a fundamental piece if we desire to increase our state's dominance. This geographical determinism doesn't mean that human free will isn't extremely important for it is but we are unable to modify the scenario in which the conflicts occur. Maps not only aid a tactician they also help the strategists:

"Strategy makes use of maps without troubling itself about triangulations..."<sup>112</sup>

A decently delineated plan absorbs maps and is guided by them, for just they show the way and present the obstacles. A tactician must read the map differently from a strategist, for his domain is more restrictive and has a clearer objective. A strategist is not worried how a military commander will overcome the enemy, he is interested in conceiving a grand design that his armed forces will then fight for. In a military offensive the person in charge is worried about how he will stop his columns from collapsing and how he will shatter the enemy's formation. Political strategies work differently, they analyze the geopolitical situation and see who can come in on our side and who wants to oppose us.

Elizabeth vanquished her internal foes for she had a solid base in the south-east. From that zone her henchmen slowly subdued the west and contained the north. From Winchester to Norwich she was able to prevent the disintegration of her base's geographical continuity. Let me finalize by mentioning that perhaps even more than cultural differences what renders states hostile to each other is the geographical conundrum for our geography plays a vast role establishing our goals. Even if states have equal values and cherish similar things they have a dissimilar discourse and want to create their own ramparts to defend their own interests.

---

<sup>112</sup> Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War* (Acheron Press, 2012) page 70

## Bibliography

Archer, Abigail. Elizabeth I (New World City, Inc.; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed., 2014)

Churchill, Winston. History of the English-Speaking peoples (Dodd, Mead & Co, 1958)

Clausewitz, Carl von. On War (Acheron Press, 2012)

Cliff, Nigel. The Last Crusade: The Epic Voyages of Vasco da Gama (Atlantic Books, 2012)

Crowley, Roger. City of Fortune. How Venice Won and Lost a Naval Empire (Faber & Faber, 2011)

Freedman, Lawrence. Strategy: A History (Oxford University Press, USA; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed., 2013)

Heuser, Beatrice. The Evolution of Strategy: Thinking War from Antiquity to the Present (Cambridge University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed., 2010)

Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan (Acheron Press, 2012)

Kennedy, Paul. Rise and Fall of British Naval Mastery (Humanity Books; 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., 2006)

Kissinger, Henry. World Order: Reflections on the Character of Nations and the Course of History (Allen Lane, 2014)

Machiavelli, Niccolò. The Prince (Oxford University Press; 1<sup>st</sup> Ed., 2008)

Machiavelli, Niccolò. The Discourses on Livy (Oxford University Press; Reissue Ed., 2009)

Machiavelli, Niccolò. The Art of War (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2014)

Machiavelli, Niccolò. The Mandrake (Dramatists Play Service, Inc. 1998)

Mattingly, Garret. The Armada (Mariner Books; Reprint Ed., 2005)

Morgenthau, Hans. Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2005)

Parker, Geoffrey. *The Grand Strategy of Philip II* (Yale University Press, 2000)

Patterson, Benton Rain. *With the Heart of a King: Elizabeth I of England and Philip II of Spain, and the Fight for a Nation's Soul and Crown* (St. Martin's Press, 2013)

Plato. *The Republic* (Penguin Classics; 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 2003)

Rank, Michael. *History's Greatest Generals: 10 Commanders Who Conquered Empires, Revolutionized Warfare, and Changed History Forever* (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013)

Ronald, Susan. *The Pirate Queen* (HarperCollins e-books; Reprint Ed., 2009)

Somerset, Anne. *Elizabeth I* (Anchor; Reprint Ed., 2010)

Sugden, John. *Sir Francis Drake* (Vintage Digital; New Ed., 2012)

Thucydides. *The Peloponnesian War* (Oxford University Press, 2009)

Waltz, Kenneth. *Theory of International Politics* (Waveland Press, 2010)

Weir, Alison. *Elizabeth, The Queen* (Ballantine Books; Reissue Ed., 1999)

Wernham, R.B. . *The Making of Elizabethan Foreign Policy, 1558-1603* (University of California Press, 1980)

Wilkinson, Paul. *International Relations A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2007)

Wilson, A.N. . *The Elizabethans* (Cornerstone Digital, 2001)