Radical groups and their influence

• Levellers - enjoyed substantial popular backing - built up as many as 40,000 signatures on popular petitions (e.g. Sovereignty of Parliament over the King). However they did NOT openly support or oppose the execution

• Key Leveller members = John Lilburne, Richard Overton and William Walwyn

• Leveller influence became more popular during 1647 (organised group of polemicists - argues the opposite to other people)

• Advocated religious toleration, wanted political and social reform

• Idea of one man, one vote which was radical for its time - wanted a unicameral government (consisting of a single chamber as a legislative assembly)

• Soldiers were attracted to these terms as they felt that the king refused them and parliament betrayed them

• Mid October 1647 - height of Leveller influence in the army - more radical agitators drew up ‘The Case of the Army Truly Stated’ which attacked the general council and discussed how all power ought to go to the people

• This culminated with the Putney debates (Edward Sexton/Thomas Rainsborough wanted universal male suffrage, Ireton argued against)

• Influence was as a result of economic distress caused by the civil war, especially in London, in a time of political and religious uncertainty, it called for reform.

• The army’s continuing negotiations with Charles over the Heads of Proposals worried the rank and file that their leaders may sell them short - the Levellers exploited this fear, denouncing Cromwell and Ireton as ‘grandees’. Divisions culminated w/ Putney Debates in Oct 1647. Agents representing rank and file criticised grandees for negotiating with Charles.

Which factors are most important in explaining the failure to reach settlement/eventual regicide?

Religion was more important – would not have happened due to Charles’ actions – this was driven (mostly) by religious beliefs. Religion and politics were very closely linked.

Religion

1. Divisions within parliament and the army were due to different approaches to religious toleration, thus the Declaration of Dislike was pushed forward by the Political Presbyterian side of parliament, e.g. Holles, who pushed it aggressively, alienating the army – religion was the stumbling block to settlement (present before war)

2. Charles’ belief in Divine Right – brought the army and the army together (alliance with the Scots); Charles believed that a settlement could not be reached without him (influenced by Henrietta Maria), led him to procrastinate and agree to parliament and the army’s terms of the army

3. Army, especially Cromwell, were very religiously motivated – Charles’ defeat in 2 civil wars was seen as God’s Providence – demonstrating religious zeal

4. Cromwell and the army believed they were carrying out God’s will by executing Charles, that it was clear that God wanted him to die – e.g. at the Battle of Preston, Cromwell concluded that the royalist defeat was ‘nothing but the hand of God’

5. April 1648 = Windsor Prayer Meeting – religious justification led the army to believe that the execution was the only option – ’that man of blood’ – refers to the Old Testament, demonstrates biblical support

Charles’ actions/intransigence

1. Belief in Divine Right – although he had made concessions in 1640-1, he did not see his position as weaker in 1646 and thus did not believe he ought to concede – did not see a possible settlement without him – thus he rejects the moderate Newcastle Propositions in 1647

2. Played off the army and parliament – agreed to consider the Newcastle Propositions in May 1647, but when presented with the Army proposals, he backs out – their divisions allowed him to procrastinate

3. Started a Second Civil War in December 1647 by allying with the Scots, after considering Four Bills from parliament – accepts to instate a Presbyterian church, despite refusing this before (power>religion) – seen as duplicitous and untrustworthy, leads to the Vote of No Addresses. This also triggered Cromwell and Ireton to take a harsher line against him: previously they had been generous (e.g. Heads of Proposals)

4. No time after 1646 did Charles show any intentions of negotiating – he wrote a letter to Henrietta Maria declaring his belief that they would eventually fall

Politics

1. Divisions between parliament and the army were due to religious divisions

2. Once the army took Charles from Holdenby House, they had political and physical advantage over parliament – they could then use their religious beliefs to justify the execution

3. Politicisation of the New Model Army came as a result of the Declaration of Dislike, thus they proposed their own terms, the Heads of Proposals
4. Reneging on the Vote of No Addresses in August 1648 angered the NMA and led to Pride's Purge – politically radical

Religious radicalism vs. Political radicalism
1. The politically radical Levellers prevented a settlement from being met – drove a wedge between rank and file and the grandees – led to the Putney Debates – Charles worried by this and driven to make deal with the Scots. Lilburne questioned the motives of the grandees, playing on the grievances of the rank and file about arrears. Important to note that the link between the army and the Political Independents was stronger than that between the army and the Levellers
2. Pride's Purge was politically radical
3. Divisions between parliament and the NMA were exacerbated by political radicalism
4. Agreement of the People in October 1647

Situation resolved. In the end the Army took control.
Dec 1648 Colonel Pride purged parliament. Soldiers allow in only those MPs prepared to put the King on trial. Army leadership and Rump decided to put king on trial and then execute him. (Jan. 1649).
Charles called ‘this man of blood’. Army leadership realized that only way to stop surge in support for the king was to execute him and declare a republic.

Scots were a further complicating factor.
In 1646 they had the King and were keen to see Presbyterian Church set up in England to match the one in Scotland. Parliament not happy with this and wanted to pay Scots off. Scots hand over king to Parliament (Jan. 47), worried about royalist Scots back in Scotland (Montrose and his royalist army). Therefore Scots leave empty handed.

Intransigence of the King
All parties in period 1646-8 assumed that the new constitution would see the King restored to power - albeit diminished. Charles believed that he could use this to hold out for better terms. Said to Rupert in 1645 'God will not suffer rebels to prosper or His cause to be overthrown'. He thought he could retain all his prerogative powers as his enemies were so divided. In addition he believed that God had turned against him (allowed his enemies to defeat him in Civil War) because he had given up some of his God-given powers before the war and because he had broken his word to God. Charles therefore not interested in terms offered to him by Parliament (Newcastle propositions) but played for time. Almost successful and helped to spark off Second Civil War (1648) by proposing that the Scots, but their 'Engager' army defeated by Cromwell at Preston. August 48 Parliament voted to make negotiations with the King and planned to bring him to London. Looked as though Charles might get even better deal.

Reasons for execution of the King
Not for ideological reasons. Those who did it (the Army grandees and their supporters in Parliament) were not republicans. Practical reasons predominated. Army leadership realized that there could be no lasting settlement with the King. Charles not prepared to negotiate seriously and had sparked off Second Civil War. Army called him 'this man of blood'. Real worry was that country would descend into anarchy if Army failed to take charge.

Charles refused to negotiate with rebels, who had taken up arms against their lawful sovereign.
Saw his opponents as revolutionaries who wished to change fundamentally the ancient 'mixed' constitution of the country - see his answer to Parliaments 19 Propositions of 1642. Revolution would lead to anarchy.
Thought his enemies would fall out amongst themselves. Thought God had moved against him in war because he had given up some of his God given prerogative powers before war began.
Would rather face martyrdom than give up more powers.

Army became politicised in reaction to growing split with moderates in Parliament. Army owed about £3 million in arrears and frightened of 'cavalier' backlash in the counties once they are disbanded. April 1647, Holles issued Declaration of Dislike - declaring that soldiers petitioning Parliament for redress of grievances were 'enemies of the State'.
Army officers and men elected a General Council of the Army. June 1647, Army seized King and in August took control of London.
Issued the Heads of the Proposals as possible basis for new monarchical constitution. Army wanted to limit power of Parliament as well as the King.
Scotland
- Arrival of Charles Stuart in Scotland made another Scottish invasion likely, with Cromwell returning from Ireland to meet this threat
- The issue of Scotland was dealt with swiftly (Battle of Dunbar) and became under the army’s control
- Charles agreed to the Covenant, and this triggered the Rump to strike first. Fairfax was too reluctant to lead the invasion, so Cromwell took his place as Commander-in-Chief
- No more than 20 of the NMA were killed, and Charles was forced to invade England with what forces he could get together, following the NMA victory at Inverkeithing. Little support for Charles in England
- New Model secured the republic at home with their victories in Scotland and Ireland

The Dutch War
- Protestant Dutch Republic appeared to be a natural ally – an international Union was considered in 1649, due to their strong bond
- Holland = wealthiest of Dutch Provinces. Orangist party as led by William of Orange made royalist exiles feel welcome.
- Dutch wanted some form of agreement, but did not want to lose their sovereignty or give away their economic advantages, but the Rump Navigation Act of 1651 = only English ships etc could bring goods into England and its colonies
- Escalating clashes at sea, followed by a full naval agreement between pro-royalist Dutch and English republican admiral = pushed to war. War was underpinned by economic competition that saw the merchant class also keen for conflict
- It created practical problems as well as army resentment at: money spent on the navy, navy being used as a political counter-weight to the army, and fighting another Protestant republic was a very bad move

Limits for the revolution
- A minority within the New Model Army shaped the Interregnum regimes. The Rump was equated with the regicide, but also with a revolutionary army. Key figures in the Rump, notably Haselrig, were strongly opposed to the NMA.
- Conservative demands for a return to political normality set against a radical minority, especially in the army and the sects who wanted to follow up what they saw as a limited political revolution of 1649.
- Fragile relationship between the NMA and parliament – authority in the land was parliament, but they could only function under the protection of the army who held the real power.

The Rump and the Army
- Rump needed to reduce army size (following the end of the Second Civil War) – they were used to having £11,000 a month
- In 1652, soldiers complained about not being paid, the Hale Commission not being implemented, the issue over the tithes not being sorted and the propagation of the gospel
- The army lost its patience with the Rump for the following reasons:
  - Failure of the Rump to arrange a new constitution (army saw themselves as God's instrument and this did not meet their idea)
  - Failure to implement social and legal reform
  - Unpopularity of the NMA
  - Failure to heal the nation’s wounds
  - Belief that the Rump resented the army’s influence

The failures of the Rump Parliament and Cromwell’s reasons for its dissolution

Reasons for the Rump’s conservatism
- Conservatism of the MPs: 22/41 MPs refused to swear on an oath approving the regicide, the abolition of the Lords and the monarchy. Further support for the regime was sought, countering the impact of Pride’s Purge, making parliament/Rump more conservative. MPs = mostly lawyers and merchants that were resistant to reform.
- Economic factors: Rump came to power during worst economic crisis of the 17th century, thus requiring a more conservative approach – there were no funds to support an extensive reform.
- Security situation: threats from Scotland, Ireland etc. meant that establishing a regime took priority over reform.
- Some people supported the Rump to counter the army’s radicalism.
- Certain radical groups created fear, e.g. The Ranters – MPs became fearful of religious reform.
- Dutch War became the focus of their attention and resources.
- The Rump essentially wanted to bring stability. Acts passed by the Rump declined over the period of their existence.

Record of the Rump (Interregnum book)
- Until recently – Rump had a poor reputation for being inefficient, self-perpetuating and only resolved when Cromwell forcibly dissolved it.
- Rump = Council of State – appointed by parliament, replacement of royal prerogative courts, privy council etc.
- David Underdown etc. believed that this view ought to be dismissed, in order to understand the magnitude of the problems the Rump faced – following 1649, they joined both executive and legislative powers, creating problems which proved too great for it to solve
Northern/ Yorkshire plot, 1663 – 50 men met with others, organised across Yorkshire, with plans to ally with rebels in Ireland and Scotland – the numbers were limited and there was a lack of immediate success, which prevented others from joining. Charles exaggerated the extent of the threat to gain support for his increasingly unpopular rule. There were other failed risings, and a problem for these was the persecution and action of the regime.

Opposition to the regime was generally ineffective and limited
1. Purging of corporations weakened dissenters
2. Summer of 1662 – regime was prepared for the imposition of the intolerant Church settlement
3. September 1662 – 5 army regiments were raised
4. December of 1662 - £70,000 was levied to support the troops
5. 1663 Act allowed the militia to be in constant readiness
6. Charles had approximately 6,000 soldiers at his disposal along with the militia

The changed nature of republicanism meant that there was limited opposition, and many had sympathies and saw these events to be workings of God's Providence, reacting to the Restoration with perplexity

What developments took place in relations between Crown and parliament?

Whig interpretation: The Cavalier House of Commons has been noted to aggressively use the 'power of the purse' to interfere with the King's prerogative powers
Supreme control of the executive administration from the Crown to the House of Commons
The Crown had been irretrievably weakened by the events of 1640-60 – the foundations of the old order had been undermined by new ideas, and the theory of divine right had been discredited and replaced with a contractual theory of monarchy
Revisionist interpretation: analyses individual parliaments in the context of events at the time – there was no pattern of development to be trace

John Miller = third way = thematic approach – these years demonstrate a conservative ruling elite struggling to make the old constitution work, rather than a vision of parliamentary sovereignty – parliament was just trying to defend itself against the twin evils of popery and arbitrary government – contemporaries were unaware of their far-reaching developments
King's attitude towards parliament and his subjects was one of distrust:
1. He interpreted advice as disaffection
2. He allowed faction within his Privy Council, playing his ministers off one another because he distrusted them (e.g. Cabal)
3. He abandoned unpopular ministers when they were attacked by parliament
4. His policies were seen partly as defensive
French alliance made political sense in the early years, it raised suspicion that Charles had absolutist tendencies, and he alienated his natural allies, parliament, the Cavaliers, with his conciliatory stance towards dissenters
Charles generally acted on what was practical rather than principled in regards to domestic affairs
His success in the long term was one of good fortune, rather than good judgment

Did parliament exercise 'power of the purse?'

Charles was dependent on parliament for most of his reign in terms of finance – he could not pursue active foreign policy without parliamentary backing
Government receipts increased greatly during his reign, to the point where income could be sufficient to meet expenditure in the 1680s. This happened for 3 reasons:
1. Tax revenue, particularly customs payments, increased as trade flourished towards the end of the reign
2. Collection of revenue was made more efficient
3. From 1670, Charles received pensions and lump sum payments from Louis XIV (essentially he became the client of LXIV rather than subject to the control of parliament)
Annually, government income increased between 1660 and 1685 – from £700,000, to 1 million in 1670, to the projected £1.2million in 1681-2
Worst financial crisis of the reign was in 1672, upon the start of the Third Dutch War, Charles declared bankruptcy
Tax increased following this – expenditure increased, even with Danby's help of finance
Revenue had been incompetently managed – parliamentary administrative reforms took place in the form of:
1662 Fraud Act, 1663 Staple Act and the 1673 Plantations Act – to increase the collection of customs
In 1667, a committee of five was given oversight to the Treasury – farmed revenue was put in the hands of commissioned officers – by 1683, even the collection of excise was put under this system – contributing factor to the increase in revenue
Despite the increase in the Crown's finance, parliament was still able to exercise power of the purse – only really effective during times of war
Hostility in relations between Crown and parliament meant that Commons would not grant finance without
Conclusion as to why Clarendon was dismissed: his arrogance was the cause of his fall from power, as it led him to fail to secure a power base in parliament, and it also meant that he did not cultivate a strong relationship with Charles, thus he was able to use Clarendon as a scapegoat. Other factors were exacerbated/blamed on him due to his arrogance.

What did the CABAL achieve/why did they fail? 1667 -72
The CABAL lacked coherent administration and they were a diverse group of ministers.

• Charles' position was, at times, undermined by the ministers, and they presented problems for Charles' authority. While Charles did not present coherence to any administration, they furthered these failings.
• Parliament did play a key role in these years, as they forced Charles' hand financially, religiously etc – Charles needed funding for the Third Dutch War, thus he was forced to end the Declaration of Indulgence and implement the Test Act instead
• Weakening of royal authority during this period = not just down to the Cabal, also down to foreign policy failure as Charles was merely a puppet of Louis XIV
• Charles also had financial problems due to his refusal to end the war
• However, Charles also used the Cabal to strengthen his own position through the manipulation of parliament – they were divided, thus he could 'divide and rule' so to speak
• There was no ascendency for an individual after Clarendon, thus Charles could follow his own policies
• While on occasion the ministers did undermine Charles' power, he generally used them effectively, and his main goal was to remain in power, even if this meant sacrificing his ministers e.g. Danby
• Other factors were more problematic for Charles in weakening his royal authority, especially the limits of his financial position
• Charles II wanted to ally with France, with Louis XIV intending on breaking up the triple alliance - he wanted a treaty before the Third Dutch War took place
• 1670 = Charles agrees to the Secret Treaty of Dover – his policy is pro-French, anti-Dutch
• England were to join Louis XIV in a military and naval attack on the Dutch in 1672, a secret clause being that England was to turn into a Catholic country, and Charles would be crowned to make sure that he kept it that way – this was dangerous to Charles as he was showing that he was sympathetic to Catholics. Clifford and Arlington are the only ones who know about the treaty
• When the Conventicle Act expired in 1667, parliament would not give Charles any money until he passed a new act – in 1670, the crown and parliament so that he will receive more money
• Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 = excludes people from penal laws – dissenters are able to worship in any way they choose. But ultimately suspends the laws – but it has no force as merely a declaration. Parliament can end it should they so choose when they are recalled. Example of Charles being an absolute ruler – suspending the laws etc.
• Upon the Third Dutch War, parliament state that unless the Declaration of Indulgence is cancelled, they will not provide Charles with any money – and he must also implement the Test Act in 1673 – this shows a first time split between court and country – the court is more pro-France, while the country are more leaning towards Protestantism
• The Cabal begins to disintegrate by 1672, with Clifford removed from the post of Lord Treasurer (due to his Catholicism) and Arlington disappearing. Shaftesbury is sacked at the end of the Dutch War in 1674, and James Duke of York, Charles' brother, is removed from the position of Lord Admiral once he declares himself a Catholic. The King advances Thomas Osbourne, the Earl of Danby in 1673, making him the new chief minister.

Notes from Nicholas Fellows
• The Cabal were seen as pursuing a strategy to make England Catholic and the monarch absolute – this was based on the belief that Charles was both of these things. After the constitutional experiments of the Interregnum, a strong monarchy was favoured, as long as it would increase stability.
• Charles had been restored with basic prerogative powers, allowing him to make an alliance with France in 1670 and the Third Dutch War and Second Declaration of Indulgence n 1672
• The 5 ministers were not a close group, with their greatest concern being their own advancement, with the period dominated with faction fighting etc. The rivalry between Arlington and Buckingham was well known, with the latter considering the former his next victim after Clarendon
• Arlington emerged as having the greatest importance, attending parliament, being a member of the privy council, sitting on the Committee of Foreign Affairs (issues mostly to do with internal security)
• Charles did not rely on them solely for advice – he chose ministers as he wished – an example of 'personal rule'
• Parliament met frequently and vetoed only 2 bills – worked with Charles?
• Appeared that Charles was trying to work with parliament – may have only been doing so for money, (he
James wanted it to go to the Privy Council

- The Gunpowder Plot of 1605 was an act attempting to restore Catholics to the throne = beginning of Popery
- 1675 – Tonge heard first rumours of Catholic plot to kill Charles, and tried to convince parliament of it, convinced himself that Jesuits had been responsible for the Great Fire of London, genuinely believed it
- Contextually, there were multiple elements to fuel the fear in Catholicism – Foxes Book of Martyrs – most popular book after the Bible, and it depicted gruesome pictures of Catholics persecuting Protestants. Between 1000-1563, the Catholics had been ‘misbehaving’ e.g. Queen Mary I burned Protestants at the stake in 1547. Pamphlets advertised the growth of Popery/absolute government etc

**Coward – belief in a Popish Plot to subvert Protestantism**

- Fear of popery was central to both the crises of 1640-41 and 1678-81 – both cases expressed a conspiracy that originated abroad that was being carried out at home in the highest levels of government in both Church and State, by men who were intent on subverting Protestantism
- The Whigs of 1678-81 believed that there was an active plot to promote Catholicism in England, as had those in 1640s, for 3 particular reasons:
  1. Religious policies and the Popish plot
     Charles II, at times, followed religious policies that seemed to be favourable Catholics – the first 20 years of his reign had shown various attempts to restrain the militant Anglican intolerance – 1662 and 1672 he had issued two Declarations of Indulgence that suspended the penal laws of the Clarendon Code against non-Anglicans
  2. Foreign policies and the Popish plot
     The Anglo-Dutch war of 1665-7 culminated in humiliation for the English due to poor management etc, ending in the Dutch sailing up the Medway and towing away many of the country’s greatest ships – the impact of this disgrace = great. This was deflected from the King onto Clarendon. More damaging to Charles was his decision to begin negotiating a treaty with France while his ministers were concluding the Triple Alliance. This was an example of Charles pursuing a personal monarchy - Charles continued to seek this alliance, personally conducting negotiations with his sister Henrietta, who was married to Louis XIV’s brother, Duke of Orleans. The reasons for this foreign policy and the decision to make the Declarations of Indulgence are not clear – but the domestic political cost of the secret treaty was great even with the implementing of the Test Act in 1673, he could not dissociate himself from the damaging Catholic and absolutist associations.
  3. British policies and the Popish plot
     Events in Ireland and Scotland, like in the 1630s, appeared to be evidence of dangerous Catholic trends – events in Ireland helped to create a fear of the court. When Duke of Ormonde replaced as Lord Lieutenant in 1669, restrictions on the Catholic church were relaxed – Ireland appeared to be a testing ground for further religious policy that could soon be brought to Britain.

**Belief that there were links between Popery and absolutism**

1. Some court trends – policies seemed to be contrary, like those of Charles I had been, especially his Indulgence policy. The declarations he had made seemed to have aroused intense opposition because they seemed to favour Catholics, but also because, as he had suspended parliamentary laws by royal decree, they were seen as a direct threat to parliamentary liberties. The declarations seemed proof of a popish/absolutist design at court, especially with the presence of Catholics at his court. Henrietta Maria pressed her son, Charles II, to favour Catholics – a lot of Catholic courtiers among Charles’ advisers e.g. Clifford and Henry Bennett – furthered by James’ conversion to Catholicism in 1669

2. Popery, absolutism and the king’s minister – Danby had adopted policies that appeared as a threat to parliamentary liberties – it was feared that the army Danby raised might be used against parliament – coupled with Danby’s distribution of money and offices to MPS in the 1670s were seen as methods to induce arbitrary and tyrannical government. Charges in the impeachment against him said that he was ‘popishly affected’ – ridiculous since he pursued a very Anglican line

3. Popery, absolutism and Bishops - many leading Bishops in the Restoration church, came to be seen as promoters of Popery as well as absolutism. It was as ridiculous as the claims that the Anglican Danby wanted to follow arbitrary policies. What gave it credibility was the widespread belief that popery = absolutism. In persecuting Protestant Dissenters, some bishops were seen to be undermining Protestant unity and thereby aiding the Catholic cause – Shaftesbury claimed that there was an ‘episcopal plot to introduce arbitrary government into Britain’ in a pamphlet in 1675.

**Finance of Charles II**

- 1665 – Royal income was £920,000
- By 1667, it had fallen to £647,000 – MPS blamed this on crown mismanagement
- Due to structural problems with the financial system, major reforms were needed, and this dated back for years and years – the context of 1558 to 1689 needs to be considered to excuse/shed light on Charles’ failure to reform finance
- The crown resorted to short-term methods
Second Conventicle Act (to fix the first one),
May: Secret Treaty of Dover – public Treaty also
1672
March: Third Dutch War begins, Second Declaration of Indulgence
1673
1674
February: Treaty of Westminster ends the Third Dutch War
Danby becomes Charles' chief minister
1675
August: Second Secret Treaty with France
1676
February: Third Secret Treaty with France
Compton Census, 1675-76 Charles makes secret subsidy agreements with Louis XIV
1677
Marriage of Mary to William of Orange
1678
July: Treaty of Nijmegen makes peace between France and the Dutch

What motivated Charles II's foreign policy?

1. Relationship with France
   - Allied with the French against the Dutch in the Third Dutch War in 1672 – left it early due to financial reasons
   - Ended the Triple Alliance of 1668 to ally with France in 1670
   - Was Charles' preference - he had been exiled here, his mother was from here, his sister married to Orleans etc
   - Spurr stated that England was a client of France, and France terrified the English
   - Pursued a Catholic foreign policy – e.g. the Secret Treaty of Dover (promise to convert to Catholicism in exchange for 2million livres and 6,000 troops) – was it for the French subsidies only in order to be independent from parliament? Or did Charles genuinely intend on converting to Catholicism? Or was allying with the French merely to get revenge on the Dutch?
   - The Secret Treaty of 1670 was followed by two more secret agreements – August 1675 and February 1676 – he promised to suspend parliament for £112 million – religion, finance, revenge and possible means to put pressure on Louis all factored
   - The money he got from the subsidies was not enough to go individual from parliament – he had to eventually declare bankruptcy – is this because he didn't convert to Catholicism or Louis did want to give him the promised money?
   - Minette, his sister married to Philip of Orleans, Louis XIV's brother, helped negotiate the Secret Treaty of 1670

2. Trade/defense
   - Renewed the Navigation Act in 1660
   - Merchants wanted the Second Dutch War
   - Triple Alliance against French – he was bought off by France – did he see them as a stronger ally/expanding?

3. Destruction of Danby's pro-Dutch policy
   - Danby's marriage of James' daughter Mary to William of Orange in 1677 = Pro-Dutch policy
   - Anglo-Dutch treaty made in 1677 meant that England were supposed to impose peace terms on Louis – parliament agreed that 30,000 men and £1million was to be raised (poll tax only brought in 30,000) – despite public policy, Charles II maintained links with Louis XIV
   - August 1677 – 2 million livres to be granted if Charles prorogued parliament and England did not go to war with France – May 1678 – more money offered to prorogue parliament and disband the army – he did not do the latter, thus neither the United Provinces nor France trusted Charles II
   - Was he pursuing an anti-Dutch foreign policy? Third Dutch War = due to wanting revenge on the Dutch for sailing up the Medway in 1667

Foreign affairs 1660-88 (Nicholas Fellows)

   - War against Dutch – alliance with Dutch against French – alliance with French against the Dutch = contradictory courses of action. Must take into account:
     1. Changing European situation – there was no political vacuum to fill
     2. Had to make the best of a difficult and changing situation, consistency was virtually impossible
     3. Charles was not in receipt of reliable information
   - Period of the Protectorate had shown great military success, and left England in a position of great European power
   - European states in great power = Dutch, French, Spanish etc (also Ottoman Empire, Sweden and Austrian Habsburg)
   - The states were in a constant flux of power, and it was hard to judge the best course of action
large number of Catholics in the Irish army, but James could not appoint a lot of officers – he would be undermining Protestant supremacy, which was essential for control in Ireland.

- The Church of England was not taken over, but conveyed a Catholic message. Publishing of propaganda was allowed, but it was not very effective as Catholics were poor and could not afford a lot of publications.
- In terms of EDUCATION, there was a Catholicising policy in Oxford and Cambridge – they had to accept the appointment of Catholics at a senior level, and awarded non-Anglicans degrees. Magdalen college – the RC president – it was supposed to be up to fellow to choose their own president. Those working at Oxbridge were seen as delivering the curriculum to the future generation – James wanted control of this in order to indoctrinate people
- The Catholic clergy was weak
  1. Poor at arguing their case and persuading people
  2. Poorly financed
  3. Jesuit attempts at recruiting people to the cause was seen as child-stealing, enticing women etc
  4. There was a poor record of Catholic missionary activity, but the Protestants viewed this differently (perception vs. reality)
- Protestants exaggerated the numbers, creating a feeling of panic and suspicion
- (Limited) successes in Ireland and Scotland were used to create insecurity
- Fears of a Catholic army in England to be used on the Protestants
- There was a general fear of a Catholic takeover, fuelled by the Popish plot, and Protestants fearing their offices being taken over
- James’ aim for Catholics was limited, but it was not perceived this way by Protestants
- Anglicans and Dissenters formed a united front

How significant was Monmouth’s rebellion? (not v important but still a factor as the bloody way James handled the rebellion increased the fear of arbitrary rule as associated with Catholicism)

- Monmouth’s plan = planned with the Duke of Argyll – to defeat James and take the throne
- Monmouth's first Declaration in 1685 called simply for a free parliament that would determine James' fate. The rebellion failed
- Monmouth's rebellion did initially get off the ground and pick up supporters as they headed towards London – known as the ‘Pitchfork Rebellion’ as it was ordnance of farmer supported James, those interested in farming etc
- James II had inherited regiments from Charles II and collected militia – he meets Monmouth for the Battle of Sedgemoor in summer of 1685. It was an army of approximately 4,000 from Monmouth versus one of approximately 10,000 from James, and the latter won
- People were hung, drawn and quartered after the rebellion. Seemed a little unfair. 800+ people transported e.g. to the West Indies. Trials known as the bloody assizes in Taunton
- Bishop Burnet was an anti-Catholic and preached to the king in a long letter: he was personally against James II and Charles II
- James was cruel and compassionless – did the ordinary people involved in a rebellion really pose a threat? Judge Jeffreys, the judge involved in the trial, deliberately set out to be cruel. James approved of it.
- Legacy of the rebellion? James builds up a standing army for security reasons. 14,000-20,000 men approximately. Reminiscent of the Major Generals and Cromwell? Characteristic of absolutism
- James promotes Catholics in the army – not allowed due to the Test Act – seen as arbitrary

Last years of James’ Reign

- James looked forward to a male heir
- Declaration of Indulgence in April 1688 was met with more opposition from Anglicans
- James ordered for this to be read in two successive Sundays in church, which would imply that the clergy supported him. They refused to do so, as they valued the church over the King
- Bishops, led by the Archbishop of Canterbury, petitioned and protested against the Declaration, arguing that it was based upon a dispensing power, which was illegal
- James punished them, imprisoning them in the Tower of London, making them martyrs
- It was a propaganda victory for the Anglicans, reinforcing the idea that Catholicism was a persecuting religion, thus uniting the Dissenters and Anglicans, led by the church
- The outcome was James’ first major defeat – the Anglican church gained more prestige, but James was still planning for the future
- Catholicism was seen as the religion of trickery and deception, and there was even rumours about the ‘Warming pan baby’ – the idea that the royal baby born on 10th June 1688 was switched at birth, as Mary of Modena had had multiple miscarriages/stillbirths
propaganda against James

- IMMORTAL SEVEN – those who sent an invitation to William of Orange, asking him to intervene. William had acted before the invitation had been sent. He was interested in England because he wanted to use it to fight against Louis XIV, as he believed Louis was trying to get rid of Protestantism in Europe – background to this was that in the 1670s (approx 1672) France had attacked the Dutch and destroyed them, leaving them very vulnerable
- William was aided by good fortune – Protestant wind/day of landing etc, Louis being occupied in the Rhinelands = good fortune rather than skill
- William had been informed that James wanted to increase his army in the winter of 1688, which would involve the increase in the number of Catholic army officers
- Supporters had been informing William of James' behaviour as early as April 1688 ad they wanted him to intervene – intervening was a considerable risk
- William agreed to invade, with the following terms being applied:
  1. Preserve the Anglican Church
  2. Respect the laws
  3. Respect the independence of the judges
  4. Respect the independence of parliament
- William did not intend to steal the crown, just to call a free parliament
- William was able to invade due to actions of Louis XIV – he waited until Louis was distracted with the Rhinelands
- William sets off October/November 1688 – very late in the campaigning season. He lands in the South-West of England on 5th November – gunpowder plot etc.
- This serves as good propaganda
- Approx 15,000 troops – James' army was larger than William's – he moves his army to Salisbury plain, but James did not engage William in battle, and historians do not know why
- Some key people, such as Churchill, Anne etc withdraw their support from James – this triggers James to have a nervous breakdown. He felt that God had abandoned him, thus he ran away when William's army reached London on 19th November 1688
- James had not abdicated, which made things difficult for parliament following his exit
- January 1689, they called a Convention parliament, with there being:
  1. Bring James back, limit his powers (not an option, because James would never agree, there would still be the problem of a Catholic heir etc)
  2. Regency for the baby (issue of a Catholic heir, it would be a dangerous unstable regency, would be weak, and any minister would be influenced the baby – and it left a power vacuum)
  3. Could declare James as having abdicated and make William king (James had not abdicated, and this would threaten the hereditary line of succession, no rule)
  4. Could abandon heredity and have an entirely new dynasty altogether, with the monarchy being monitored and agreed by parliament. This would follow the idea that by running away, James had broken his contract
- They agreed that Mary and William would rule, and if they had children, then their children would be in line to the throne. If William died first, Mary could remarry and her children could take the throne. If Mary died first, which she did, William's children to anyone else could not take the throne. It had to follow the line of a Protestant Stuart, thus the throne passed on to Mary's sister, Anne
- 1701 – Act of Succession – Sophia of Hanover was declared next in line to the throne (she died before this happened, thus George became king)
- William and Mary were only offered the throne with certain conditions (known as the Declaration of Rights/Bill of Rights:
  1. No standing army in peace time
  2. No interfering with the law – the end of dispensing and suspending powers
  3. All penalties against Catholics were to be maintained, thus they still could not hold offices etc.
  4. Elections in parliament had to be free
  1. Catholics to be excluded from the succession
  2. Mutiny Act – parliament must meet every year to allow William and Mary to have an army
  3. Financial settlement – William and Mary were granted £1.2m a year (dispensed by parliament, with rules about how the money could be spent/who it could be given to) – parliament provided the money for war etc
- Parliament was stronger as a result but there were no intentions to remove power from the monarch – they still needed to work together