alone was not enough to make War an inevitability, the reduction of his power and ability to rule without consulting parliament were however inevitable.

- Chap 1: argues civil war could be attributed to 7 events or factors: why the bishop’s wars occurred, why England lost, the lack of political settlement in England, the failure to dissolve the long parliament in 1641, lack of negotiation to avoid war, respect for majesty becoming diminished, key Q: to what extent were these factors due to chance? Clear element of chance, if Irish rebellion had occurred slightly later, long parliament would not have remained in session, would have been no parliament to fight a civil war (p.213) – does this suggest more or less inevitability? If something is down to chance can it ever be truly avoided, likely no.

- Events not entirely fortuitous, 3 long-term causes of instability dating back to before Charles took to the throne, fairly universal issues faced by European monarchies, not specifically English, came to head in England and Netherlands at the same time, 3 issues: problem of multiple kingdoms, religious division, breakdown of financial and political system in face of inflation and cost of war – if these problems were largely common with many other countries, which did not erupt into civil war when they were faced with them, it would suggest that these long term factors alone were not enough to lead to an inevitable civil war, suggest that it was Charles’ inability to handle these problems that meant war became largely unavoidable, there was little chance of England resolving these issues under Charles’ leadership meaning the only really way of addressing said problems was to overthrow Charles as monarch, Charles’ refusal to negotiate meant a forcible overthrow was the only option, and the support of royalists in favour of Charles meant some sort of battle was sure to ensue.

- 3 nation problem: English tried to pretend 3 nation did not exist, James and Charles fell into trap of trying to rule Britain as if it were England, peaked in 1637, failure to understand difference in culture – long term cause, argue tension still present today?

- Religion: derived from belief that ‘religion ought to be enforced’, difficulty in adjusting in society function on the assumption it has a single church when it is actually home to many faiths (p.214), reformation as ‘a cause of instability in every country where it happened’ only avoided when persecution was too successful to allow for freedom of belief, ‘England was by no means peculiar’, nation problem and religious problem become merged when Scottish army enter England (p.215) – the idea that the religious problem was not unique and was faced in many countries where civil war did not break out, suggests that was not inevitable, at least not as a result of this factor alone, the complex interlinking web of factors leading up to the civil war made the conflict inevitable.

- Finance, politics and military: combo of inflation and rising cost of war: ‘the military revolution’, also European theme, growing use of gunpowder and larger scale armies had meant war had become increasingly expensive, Britain were unable to levy sufficient taxes to cover these costs, only Netherlands able to do so due to visible threat of enemy, Spain faced similar problems with levying taxes (p.215) – alone not enough to cause war, other countries in similar position but did not face war, what made England different?

- ‘took the conjunction of all three to drive England into civil war’, it is fact that no single factor caused war, religion and finance had been issues since 1550’s and had not created civil war in those 90 years, England in 1637 was a country with clear discontents but was still in essence peaceful and stable, doesn’t show signs of being on the verge of war, not right to assert that civil war could not have happened without Scottish invasion (p.216) – at this stage civil war was not an inevitability, war was not imminent in 1637