Charles had no intention of ruling for definite or indefinite period without Parliament.
In his Declaration of 10 March, he maintained that he had been driven “unwillingly out of that course” and that he intended to recall Parliament “when such as have bred this interruption shall have received their punishment”.
He was convinced of a conspiracy “that all things may be overwhelmed with anarchy and confusion”.
He stressed his determination to maintain divinely ordained order in Church and State and his belief in his divine right: “Princes are not bound to give an account of their actions, but to God alone.”
Legal for King to rule without Parliament provided he remained within framework of law.
Apart from Parliament, all normal institutions of govt operated.
No evidence of attempt to change framework of constitution, or to set up a tyranny.
Charles lacked financial, military and administrative capacity to have an effective tyranny.
Wanted efficient and effective govt.
This policy is given name of “Thorough”.
Charles intended to rule by benevolent prerogative power, but absence of contact point of Parliament and apparent inaccessibility of Privy Council and Court were threats to many areas of law, finance and religion.
In minds of some parliaments, experiences of 1620s made prerogative rule synonymous with arbitrary rule.
Later Whig historians such as Lord Macaulay and G.M. Trevelyan, see years without Parliament as years which justify description of “Eleven Years Tyranny”.
To sustain personal rule and anticipate cooperative Parliament at end of it, Charles needed to avoid confrontation in following areas:
  o Financing his rule without Parliament.
  o Asserting his authority in matters of law, religion, choice of Councillors throughout the monarchy.
His subjects wanted rule that was firm and fair.
Recent research by historian Kevin Sharpe stresses success of Personal Rule in a number of areas, until crisis in Scotland.
By 1637 Charles I’s policies were being openly challenged.
By 1640 Personal Rule ended as a result of accumulated tensions in key areas.
Until then, aspects of Charles’s rule were benevolent in intention.

**How successfully did Charles finance his Rule without Parliament?**

- Ambitious foreign policy of 1620s was at bottom of many problems facing Charles.
- He made peace with France in 1629 and with Spain a year later.
- This was important in enabling Personal Rule.
Arminians, Laudians, high-church men and anti-Calvinists: a fudge?

- Term “Arminian” is loosely used when referring to reign of Charles I.
- Dutch theologian, Arminius, took an anti-Calvinist stand against predestination.
- Stressed importance of free will and good works in achieving salvation.
- While theological point is a characteristic of English Arminians, their importance lies in the prominence they gave to ritual and ceremony: “the beauty of holiness”, and the sanctity of the authority of the bishops derived from Christ’s calling of Peter.
- This meant they were stressing the Catholic origins of the English Church at a time when Calvinist Puritans wanted the removal of all vestiges of the Roman Catholic Church. “the Whore of Babylon”.
- In this sense, English Arminians were both anti-Calvinists and anti-high-church men.
- In late 1620s and 1630s, they were Laudians in that they followed ecclesiastical programme of William Laud.
- Its political implications were the tightening of royal control of the Church through rigorous discipline of dissidents, as well as attempts to improve the economic foundations of the church.

How important was the work of William Laud: Thorough, Church and State?

- Laud was personally unpopular.
- Sir Simond D’Ewes described him as “a little, low red-faced man of mean parentage”.
- Lambert Osbaldeston, a master at Westminster School, called him a “little, meddling, hoocuspus”.
- Apart from using Buckingham to get into the Court, and associating with Wentworth in the pursuit of centralization, William Laud was a loner.
- The policies he pursued were insensitive.
- The bureaucratic efficiency with which he pursued them realised the fears expressed by James as early as 1617: “He hath a restless spirit, and cannot see when matters are well, but loves to toss and change and bring things to a pitch of reformation floating in his own brain.”
- Coming from the master of masterly activity, this should be looked at cautiously.
- There is no doubt that Laud’s single-mindedness and sincerity, commendable in themselves, were very risky in the religious climate of the 1620s and 1630s.
- Kevin Sharpe has rightly stressed that Laud was following the policies of the King.
- He plays down Laud’s so-called Arminianism.
- Laud was made a scapegoat for the religious ills of the country but, without Laud, the policies of Charles I would not have been carried out with such efficiency.
- Laud was feared for the conservation of his ideas.
Both sides were recruiting before Charles raised his standard at Nottingham on 22 August 1642.

In some ways the more interesting question is when did the civil war begin, rather than why.

Certainly, after leaving London in January, Charles I had left the initiative with those who were pushing for further reform.

The “high road” to Civil War?

“causes of the English Civil War” provide the most investigated topic in English historiography.

Has gained new lease of life in wake of historical research, which promotes the role played by affairs in Scotland and Ireland in resisting English govt.

The debate has been engaged ever since the 17th century.

Excellent surveys of the historiography of this are given by H. Tomlinson and by R.C. Richardson.

Contemporaries such as Edward Hyde (later Earl of Clarendon), Richard Baxter and Lucy Hutchinson are astute, informative and involved.

Whig interpretation of the causes of the Civil War held sway in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Leading exponents of this have one thing in common – they could all write brilliant prose.

Lord Macaulay, S.R. Gardiner and G.M. Trevelyan are worth reading for their fluent persuasive writing.

Theme is of monarchy frustrating the evolution of parliamentary govt.

In this sense, the Civil War is part of a revolutionary political process – there is a “high road” to civil war.

Religion emerges as important in that the Puritans were not only religious enemies of arbitrary rule, but political enemies too.

Another long-term view is that of the Marxist interpreters.

Here the social and economic motives are the dynamics of history, the substructure that determines politics, while religion is the superstructure.

Marxists see the progress of history as the result of class struggle.

In 17th century economy and society (represented by Charles I) and the emergence of a bourgeois, capitalist society (represented by Charles I) and the emergence of a bourgeois, capitalist society (represented by the opponents of Charles in the Providence Island Company).

The War was part of this process which, in turn, was part of the overall progression to a classless society.

This approach places great emphasis on opposition to Crown policies coming from rising gentry and emergent commercial interests.

The historian Christopher Hill was influenced by this theory, linking religion to its social and economic substructure.

R.H. Tawney links religion to the rise of capitalism.

Lawrence Stone is also influenced by the ideas of Marxists.

He sees the causes in terms of “preconditions”, “precipitants” and “triggers”.

In recent years, research has produced great developments, moving away from long-term causes.
Johann Sommerville argues deep-rooted causes of War go beyond “functional breakdown” after 1639.

Functional breakdown in 1639-49.
Religion was highly emotive and contentious issue.
Charles was an inept king,
His monarchy was overstretched in three kingdoms.
Long Parliament was like no other Parliament of Charles’s reign.
Problems specific to his reign had long-term, wide-ranging origins.
Ultimately Charles I made a personal decision to fight for his prerogative.

First Civil War

How was England governed during the Civil Wars?

- After Charles’s failed attempt to arrest five members of Parliament, little sign of serious bid to avoid war.
- 10 Jan Charles left London.
- Both he and Parliament exploring military option, with control of magazine at Hull being main objective.
- Next day Charles appointed Earl of Newcastle as governor of Hull while Parliament nominated Sir John Hotham to same position.
- Charles travelled north and in April sent his son, Duke of York, and the Elector Palatine in a bid to secure Hull.
- In a serious blow to the King, from strategic and military point of view, Hotham refused Charles entry to the town.
- He made it clear, stronghold and port of Hull would be Parliamentarian.
- From spring of 1642, the two sides were establishing the means to raise armies.
- Use by Parliament of an Ordinance (legislation passed without royal consent) was further provocation to king.
- In using Commissions of Array (medieval method of raising troops) to raise his army, Charles was emphasizing his willingness to use any means to retain control, just as he had done during Personal Rule.
- Great blow to Parliament was loss of the Great Seal.
- In May, Lord Keeper Littleton sent Seal to the King in Oxford.
- This threw Parliament’s administration of justice into disarray and prevented it from fulfilling legal functions of govt.
- Not until mid-1643 that Parliament issued its own Great Seal, which was immediately condemned by the King.
- June 1642, Parl offered Charles, now in residence in York, the Nineteen Propositions.
- Meant to be set of proposals to avoid war, but little compromise in this document.
- Nineteen Propositions included:
  - Parl was to approve King’s choice of advisers and important govt decisions.
• The Assembly also drew up the Calvinist Confession of Faith and the promised plans for changing the structure of the Church.
• The decisions of the Assembly were not, however, unanimous.
• A minority of members was more independently minded and, in January 1644, five of them issued alternative proposals in “An Apologetical Narration”.
• Much has been made of the so-called toleration this put forward, although in fact its proposals were similar to those of the mainstream members.
• Nevertheless, it was a significant development in view of the political clashes between the Presbyterians and Independents later in the 1640s.
• Besides these changes, Parliament turned its attention to the clergy.
• The Committee for Scandalous Ministers ejected Royalist clergy, while the Committee for Plundered Ministers provided support for godly ministers expelled from Royalist areas.
• Due to the circumstances of the war, these reforms were implemented patchily, often initiated by local communities.
• Local studies have revealed widespread and active resistance to Parliament’s Ordinances concerning religion.
  o Feasts continued to be observed.
  o The Directory of Worship was not used.
  o Those who failed to comply were not prosecuted.
• Neither the King nor Parliament provided a clear lead.
• The historian John Morrill suggests, in The Impact of the English Civil War (1991), that the main reason for the conservatism was that the majority preferred the Episcopalian Church.

What were the Royalists’ advantages and what problems did they face?

• Obvious advantage of having rightful ruler of country as their leader.
  Obedience was imprinted on the minds of the populace, and the King could expect his orders to be followed.
• However no swift response to Commissions of Array.
• Noticeable that Charles’s organization of the war effort was less coherent than that of Parliament.
• He also introduced potentially unpopular measures, such as impressment and excise duty, only after Parliament had taken the lead.
• Traditional view is that those of higher rank among the elite tended to support the King.
• This gave him an initial financial and, perhaps, military advantage.
• More of the Lords supported the King than supported Parliament and there is plenty of evidence of generous donations to the royalist efforts from members of the higher gentry.
• It would, however, be difficult for individuals to sustain this level of financial support.
• This class also traditionally provided the officers within the army and many had experience in the wars then raging on the continent.
• Charles missed an opportunity – if he had acted quickly he could have taken London.
• The Earl of Essex withdrew towards Warwick, leaving road to London open, however Charles hesitated, moving to Oxford allowing Essex to reach London before Charles.
• Opportunity for speedy victory was lost.

**Battle of Marston Moor: 2 July 1644**

• At 7pm Parliamentarian army launched surprise attack and following a confused fight lasting only 2 hours, Parliamentarian cavalry under Oliver Cromwell routed Prince Rupert’s Royalist cavalry and declined their infantry.
• Battle confirmed how a well-equipped and trained army could win the war and established Cromwell’s reputation as a great commander.
• The Royalists effectively abandoned all control in the north of England.

**The Battle of Naseby: 14 June 1645**

• First battle fought with New Model Army.
• The King was persuaded by his more reckless advisers to engage the New Model Army.
• It was military suicide to attack uphill against a force nearly double the size of his own.
• The royalists, though outnumbered 14,000 to nearly 10,000, advanced all along the line of Broad Moor.
• Rupert was successful in driving back the left wing of Parliamentary cavalry under General Henry Ireton but made mistake of engaging in wild pursuits thus leaving the surrounded royalist infantry in the centre unsupported.
• More disciplined Parliamentary cavalry under Cromwell was then able to regroup and deliver a decisive assault on the centre.
• As a result the royalist army was completely routed, with the Parliamentarians taking about 4000 prisoners and the royalists’ artillery.
• With the loss of his best infantry regiments at Naseby, Charles could no longer meet the New Model Army in open battle and had effectively lost the war.

**Why did Parliament win the First Civil War?**

• Historian Ronald Hutton concludes that in the end it was the failure of the localities to cooperate with the King and his consequent inability to supply his armies that forced him to surrender.
• Ability to collect revenue, muster and equip an army and provide effective military leadership are obvious prerequisites of victory.
• In a prolonged war maintaining support, enthusiasm and momentum by practical and propaganda means are also important.
• In the Civil War there are some underlying factors that created the conditions in which Parliamentary victory was possible, such as Parliament’s control of the wealthy south-east of England, especially London, along with control of the navy and the widespread fear of Roman Catholicism.
• He rejected them all.
• This makes it tempting to blame King for failure to reach settlement.
• His character meant it was hard for him to negotiate.
• His belief in divine right of kings made it impossible for him to accept either the implicit admission of his guilt or limitations on his power, such as the restriction on his right to bestow mercy denoted by the lists of war criminals.
• However, Charles did make significant concessions to Parliament in 1640-41 and surely his position was even weaker now.
• Assuming he was not aiming to become a martyr, this was not how Charles perceived the situation.
• Firstly he failed to recognize that his position was weaker than it had been before the civil war commenced.
• Secondly, it was clear to king that his opponents were not united in their quest for a settlement.
• During war, there had been clear signs of division, manifested in debates of winter 1644-45.
• Must have seemed to Charles that the longer he prevaricated (spoke falsely) the more likely it would be that his opponents would break rank, thus enabling him to reach more advantageous settlement.
• If Charles was counting on disunity among his opponents, then it is important to identify reasons for these divisions.
• Parliament had made Charles number of propositions before and during the war.
• After his surrender they were adapted to become the Newcastle Propositions.
• The only substantial difference between June 1642 and July 1646 lies in religious settlement proposed. This can be attributed to signing of Solemn League and Covenant.
• Problem now lay in process of negotiation, carrying with it the implication of compromise.
• Majority of Parliament might be willing to step down from harsh terms dictated in proposals, but its soldiers had fought the war and had taken seriously the cause for which they risked their lives.
• Nine months after the Newcastle Propositions were put to him, Charles’s third reply, in May 1647, indicated willingness to compromise on matters relating to church and military.
• By then, it was too late.
• Army’s suspicions about Parliament’s intentions had been roused and a new dimension added to the equation.

Why did the Army become politicized?
• August 1647, Army put forward to Charles peace terms known as the “Heads of the Proposals”.
• They were in many respects more lenient that those offered by Parliament.
- The Army held the King, who preferred its proposals, and it had occupied Westminster.
- But the Army was not united in its aims.
- Suspicion of Oliver Cromwell’s negotiations as both Grandee and MP, as well as the arrival of Scottish Commissioners to speak with the King, brought matters to a head.
- At Putney Church, the Army Council debated new and radical proposals continued in the “Agreement of the People”.
- Records of the debates provide historians with a fascinating insight into the extent to which radical thinking had developed.
- But the discussion was relevant to the course of events only in as much as it convinced the Grandees of the need to regain the initiative.
- The Army Council was dispersed and the rendezvous at Ware provided the Grandees with the excuse to re-impose discipline.
- Interpreting the actions of some soldiers who arrived without their officers as mutiny, they court-martialled the ringleaders.
- The unfortunate Richard Arnold was chosen by lot to undergo his sentence on the spot. The remaining two meetings occurred without incident.
- The civilian Leveller leaders petitioned Parliament but were arrested.
- The Grandees used the opportunity provided by the decision to reduce the army by 50% in January-February 1648 to undertake a political purge of most radical regiments.
- However, by this time the King had shown his complete disregard for the process of negotiation.
- His escape to the Isle of Wight, the offer of peace proposals and his protracted consideration of the Four Bills based on them, all revealed him to be playing for time while he negotiated the “Engagement” with the Scots. Reacting to his negative response to the Four Bills, as well as to news of the “Engagement”, Parliament voted that no further addresses be made to Charles.
- This was a less radical solution than impeachment and the imposition of a settlement without reference to the King, as proposed by Oliver Cromwell.

Why was the King executed?
- The Second Civil War, deliberately instigated by the King, marked the point of no return for the Army.
- At the Windsor Prayer Meeting of April 1648, first mention is made of Charles Stuart “that man of blood”.
- The Army increasingly regarded itself as the instrument of God’s providence in dealing with Charles, whom they interpreted to be the Antichrist ignoring God’s will.
- From a military point of view, the war was relatively insignificant.
- Uprisings in England were poorly coordinated in relation to the Scottish invasion, although Royalist support was stronger than Fairfax had anticipated.
Recognizing that Parliament, as well as the Head of State, could be tyrannical, the executive and legislative were separated.

No legislation was allowed which would alter the fundamentals of the Instrument.

This prevented Parliament from undermining the religious toleration that was introduced.

The historian Barry Coward, in *The Stuart Age*, contrasts the Nominated Assembly and the Instrument, describing the latter as “a victory for the conservative wing of the army”.

What did the Protectorate achieve?

- Cromwell’s rule achieved a good deal that can easily be overshadowed by concentrating on an analysis of the weaknesses, which led to the downfall of the Protectorate.
- There was success in:
  - Maintaining law and order and defending the country from overseas invasion.
  - Reconciling some of the traditional ruling elite to the regime.
  - The encouragement of economic development and raising England’s international prestige.
- The lack of trouble from Royalists and Commonwealthsmen was achieved through a combination of luck and skill.
- Charles II gave no clear lead to his followers. John Lilburne died in prison after his return from exile and opponents in the army who did not resign were either cashiered or dispersed across the British Isles.
- That the regime remained relatively tolerant of a range of religious views and practices can also be regarded as a mark of success in that it fulfilled Cromwell’s aim and anticipated later developments.

How did Cromwell approach “healing and settling”?

- In many ways, Cromwell’s actions can be regarded as paradoxical.
- In religious terms, he was remarkably tolerant for the period.
- In political terms, he was undoubtedly conservative.
- Cromwell was also pragmatic, appreciating that the regime could not survive without a wide range of support particularly from London merchants and civilian office-holders.
- He was perhaps too optimistic in supposing that this could be achieved so soon after the divisive events of the 1640s and early 1650s, and in the context of a constitution introduced by the Army.
- Cromwell tried to reconcile the traditional ruling elite to the regime.
- His Council contained civilians and military men in a ratio 2:1.
- Apart from four officers, the military men were no longer active soldiers.
- He aimed to relax central government pressure on the localities, placing greater trust in the county gentry.
Many of the Grandees still favoured the Protectorate, but they were overruled by the junior officers and rank-and-file who demanded the return of the Rump Parliament.

This underlines the political bankruptcy of the Interregnum.

No new suggestions were forthcoming at this juncture.

Further problems created by divisions within the army will become apparent when the role of Monck is examined.

**What role did Monck play in the restoration of monarchy?**

- General Monck was one of the less politically involved army Grandees.
- At each change of regime or leader, he declared his loyalty.
- When the Rump was dismissed in October 1659, Sir Arthur Haselrig, one of its leaders, had appealed for help.
- Monck responded, moving his army to the English border.
- This action, along with the Navy declaring for the Rump, caused the Committee of Safety to restore the Rump.
- Monck then moved south, declaring that he was acting to defend Parliaments.
- Whether he meant the Rump or the whole Long Parliament is uncertain.
- Nevertheless, when he arrived in London, which was in almost open rebellion, he readmitted the secluded members.
- The republicans were in a minority.
- Monck’s agreement with the secluded members was that they would dissolve the parliament and call fresh elections.
- This they did.
- This agreement meant that the restoration of monarchy was a certainty.
- Monck’s actions had been decisive in securing this event.

Monck then concluded secret negotiations with the court of Charles II.

- This led to Charles’s Declaration of Breda, drawn up with advice from Edward Hyde who was in turn influenced by Monck’s suggestions.
- Monck presented it to the new Convention Parliament.
- Its terms were so reasonable and the situation in England so chaotic that the Restoration was secured unconditionally.
- Again, Monck’s actions served to speed events and affect their course.
- When Charles II triumphantly entered London, Monck was at his side.
- The historian Barry Williams, in *The Elusive Settlement* (1984), regards him as the crucial figure in the events leading to the Restoration.

**How important were the actions of Charles II in bringing about the Restoration?**

- The actions of Charles II were also important.
- Inevitably, his political and religious leanings were a major concern and possible barrier to restoration of the monarchy.
- Having accepted the advice to base his court in the Protestant Netherlands rather than a Catholic country, Charles gave enough hints about his approach to politics and religion to satisfy the Convention Parliament.