The reading this week ended up sparking many more questions than it answered for me. Namely, why a Bourbon King, how did Spain get how it did, and why does it seem everyone is so complicit with everything that happened in the past and present (in terms of time period of the reading). There are several other questions, but are mainly a point of opinion that don’t require argument relating to the British and French influence.

To begin, when reading through the content, I realized that though the new King was chosen as what seemed to be a stipulation of a treaty, it never fully discusses how the replacement was in fact chosen. Did the British and French have a vested interest in this man, or was he chosen as the most qualified individual at the time? It doesn’t seem reasonable to me that another country would be overwhelmingly concerned with Spain’s success, and in fact I would have thought they would only play the cards in a way that would directly benefit them, ie. Corruption would have been extremely beneficial with extorting money and takeovers of additional land.

Next, I was very curious as to why the Spaniards allowed Charles II to cause spain to be in the state that it was in. I would have thought that the people would have stopped it before it got that bad! In addition, an ailing King is a weak one, it doesn’t make sense that they allowed generations of Kings, especially the last with no heir rein in power. When the British weren’t happy they split off and moved to the Americas, why didn’t the Spanish Americas do this? Possibly because they were still in good standing with the throne and were too proud, or were there other variables I am missing?

Finally, I am just surprised how the Spaniards seemed to just allow the Bourbon Reform to happen, limiting the church and revamping the government and economy. Sure it sounds like a great thing, but there is a large amount of room for error, and it seemed that most people didn’t raise any question over the authority figures making the changes!