

goes on to describe competencies and attaches a series of exercises to develop these competencies.

In closing, *History.edu* provides a valuable service in describing what is being done to incorporate technology into the classroom. Its articles are thought provoking and idea stimulating. Its footnotes are a virtual goldmine of usable information. *History.edu* is well worth the price.

Tidewater Community College & Saint Leo College

John R. Moore

David Loades. *Power in Tudor England*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. Pp. viii, 183. Cloth, \$49.95; ISBN 0-312-16391-6. Paper, \$18.95; ISBN 0-312-16392-4. Roger Lockyer. *James VI & I*. London & New York: Longman, 1998. Pp. vi, 234. Cloth, \$63.75; ISBN 0-582-27962-3. Paper, \$17.95; ISBN 0-582-27961-5. Derek Hirst. *England in Conflict, 1603-1660—Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth*. London: Arnold (co-published in the U.S.A. by Oxford University Press), 1999. Pp. vii, 359. Cloth, \$80.00; ISBN 0-340-74144-9. Paper, \$24.95; ISBN 0-340-62501-5.

Tudor-Stuart England has long captured the imaginations of Americans, and that fascination has certainly been reflected in the realm of textbook publication. The three works discussed in this review attempt to make accessible to the current generation of students the most recent scholarship on early modern England—unfortunately, with mixed results.

It is a common assertion that the Tudor monarchs created an efficient and centralized state with none of the traditional tools of despotism—an army, navy, or large bureaucracy. It is also widely acknowledged that the secret of Tudor success was the widespread support, cooperation, and free service of local and provincial elites. In *Power in Tudor England*, David Loades takes all of this a step further by examining exactly how this alliance between the “political nation” and the monarchy actually worked. Using an extensive range of secondary and primary sources, Loades examines “the interaction between the central machinery of government ... and the local and provincial elites” who dominated their own communities. His self-stated aim is to do all this in as “succinct and comprehensible a manner as possible.”

He is certainly succinct. In a series of short chapters Loades examines the nature of Tudor monarchy, the economic and administrative structures the Tudors inherited from their medieval predecessors, the Council, Royal Commissions, Parliament, and the royal court. He finishes with a look at the exercise of Tudor power in “special jurisdictions” (e.g. Wales, Ireland, the Channel Islands) and the problems posed by distinctive regional and cultural identities. With the exception of Ireland, Loades writes, Tudor government worked. The monarchs created a partnership with the

nobility and gentry and town elites, establishing "a ruling class of remarkable comprehensiveness and durability." Though much of the material is technical and not especially suitable for introductory classes, instructors will find the chapters on the monarchy and parliament valuable. Also, the final chapter on regional identities is certainly relevant given the challenge that ethnic and religious nationalisms pose to many traditional nation states, including the United Kingdom.

Lamentably, the book is not reader friendly. While there are informational gems strewn throughout the book, the author's penchant for dense, extremely long paragraphs (often a page in length, sometimes two) makes the gems difficult to mine. As a result, most students, I imagine, would find the book unreadable, and even scholars with a passion for administrative and legal history will find the book a rough go.

Far more readable and interesting is Roger Lockyer's *James VI & I*, part of Longman's Profiles in Power series. James Stuart has never had a good press, and he often gets little attention in history surveys, sandwiched as he is between the reign of Elizabeth and the dramatic events of the English Civil War. Contemporaries with an ax to grind, and later historians, have portrayed James as a crude, cowardly, ineffectual king who, in Macaulay's words, talked "in the style alternately of a buffoon and of a pedagogue" (a picture not much altered in D.H. Wilson's standard biography published in 1956). James's reign, in this view, was a corrupt and dismal coda to the golden age of Elizabeth.

Lockyer takes issue with much of this. Using primary sources and the work of many revisionist historians whose work is not widely known, Lockyer rehabilitates James. He admits there is no reason to think the first Stuart deserves the title "James the Great," but "he deserves to be remembered as 'James the Just' or 'James the Well-Intentioned.'" Given the fact that the vast majority of rulers merit no such appellation," Lockyer continues, "James's subject were lucky to have him as their king."

After the first chapter, which provides an overview of James's life before he assumed the English crown in 1603, the book is organized topically. In successive chapters Lockyer examines James's political ideas, his attempts to unify England and Scotland under a single government (he failed), his relations with Parliament, and his successes and failures in finance, religion, diplomacy, and government. James, according to Lockyer, was "probably the best-educated ruler ever to sit on an English or Scottish throne" (a chilling thought, that), and displayed real political savvy as king of Scotland, successfully negotiating the Byzantine political intrigues of the age.

As king of England, Lockyer states, James was far more effective than he is usually given credit for. James was a moderate who tried (often unsuccessfully) to temper the extremes of public opinion in politics and religion. He attempted, for instance, to marginalize radical Catholics and radical Puritans in the hope that the great majority would conform to the Anglican Church, or, at least, keep a low profile. Internationally he tried to counter the extreme anti-Spanish sentiments that constantly

threatened to plunge England into a war he couldn't pay for. (A map of Europe in 1618 would have been a useful addition.) Finally, Lockyer makes the point that even James's "failings" (e.g., selling of offices, advancing the interests of his personal favorites, his spendthrift ways) must be understood in the broader context of European politics. Much of what James did, Lockyer insists, "was typical of early modern monarchies."

In sum, this is a good book, but perhaps more appropriate for instructors than students, especially beginners. The topical organization assumes some prior familiarity with James's reign and the extensive use of contemporary quotations (often confusing for the uninitiated) would make the book a challenging read for many typical undergraduates. Also, I wonder why instructors would choose to assign a book on James I, when other titles in the same series include *Elizabeth I* and *Cromwell*.

The final book in this trilogy is Derek Hirst's *England in Conflict*, a "reconceptualisation" of his 1986 book, *Authority and Conflict*, which was published originally as part of Edward Arnold's series of texts covering English history from the late middle ages to the twentieth century. *England in Conflict* is an erudite and nuanced survey of the early Stuart period that attempts to embed the English story into a broader British framework. The accession of James Stuart, in Hirst's opinion, marked a major turning point in English history, in part because Ireland and Scotland had, by that time, come firmly into the English political orbit. "What gives a tragic, and chaotic, character to the years 1603-60," Hirst claims, "is their determined and often violent probing of the new British realities." As such, many of the traditional verities about political progress during this period become "harder to sustain when English history reverberates in the experience of Scotland and Ireland." In addition to paying greater attention to the British context, this re-visioning of Hirst's earlier volume incorporates the work of "the historians of women, whose increasingly richly layered work has been the other great historiographic development of recent years."

Three introductory thematic chapters provide an overview of politics, religion, and the economy. Ten narrative chapters then carry the story chronologically from 1603 to 1660. Throughout the book Hirst judiciously balances the most convincing elements of both traditional and revisionist scholarship. (The bibliographical essay is an excellent compendium of the most up-to-date scholarship, for the most part published since the earlier edition of this book.) Hirst argues that England ultimately followed a path to revolution when the Stuarts, father and son, refused to implement necessary economic and political reforms. Emphasizing the contingency of day-to-day events, he shows that the civil war was only one of many possible outcomes. The subtitle of the book—"Kingdom, Community, Commonwealth"—reflects a persistent leitmotif in which Hirst argues that the upheavals of the period resulted in the transformation of the traditional organic conception of the state (the "body politic") into a more modern understanding of the state as a collective enterprise, representing a broader public interest.

However rich the tapestry woven by Hirst, the book is more suited to professors and graduate students than to American undergraduates. (I would alter this assessment were I writing for a British audience.) The conceptual sophistication of the book assumes at least a basic grounding in the subject, a grounding most American undergraduates don't have. Furthermore, the writing is dry, and, too often, abstruse. A strength of the book is the attention to myriad regional differences, yet the lack of maps will put American students unfamiliar with British geography at a disadvantage. Finally, scholars will be disappointed with the lack of source references, apparently a mandate of the publisher.

Webster University

Michael J. Salevouris

**John E. Archer. *Social Unrest and Popular Protest in England 1780-1840*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Pp. 110. Cloth \$39.95; ISBN 0-521-57216-9. Paper, \$12.95; ISBN 0-521-57656-3.**

This book is a brief study of the current historical literature on just what the title describes, English social unrest and popular protest over a sixty-year time span. Its target audience in Great Britain is high school age students preparing for examinations. The most likely audience in the United States is graduate students preparing for doctoral qualifying examinations. The reason for this disparity is that, because of limited space, the author must presume a great deal of knowledge on the reader's part. As a result, someone who cannot identify Captain Swing or a knitting frame or the Combination Acts will find very little of use. However, for those with the background, it is a useful, well-written study of the major subjects and their subdivisions.

The topics covered include both urban and rural protests as well as the governmental responses to them. One of the principal themes is that the move from a paternalistic style of economics, in which the English upper classes supposedly felt some sense of obligation to the working classes, to the laissez-faire economy of the industrial age, in which the "invisible hand" would take care of everyone, rich or poor, to mitigate social and economic problems, was useless at best and harmful at worst. The author explains that the earlier type of economics is what one of the key historians for the period, E.P. Thompson, refers to as the moral economy, and goes on to point out how much of the early protest was an effort to convince the dominant classes to restore that sense of moral obligation. The book also discusses another of the chief historical researchers of this era, George Rudé, who noted that when the protesters of the era used violence, they generally focused it on property rather than people. What is more, so-called mob action was usually very much under control and directed at specific targets. Despite some early protester successes, the new economy gradually drove out the old.