

LO: To understand feedback
from 02/03/04 question and to
revise the how far monarchy
changed during the time period
1603-1702

To what extent did divisions between parliament and the army lead to the failure of a settlement by 1649?

- **What is the answer?**
- That is what you **argue** – whilst giving balance
 - showing there are other possible theories that you don't agree with (explained) or other smaller contributing factors which are smaller because...(explained)
- You need to have a judgement before you start writing
- You need an intro – your judgement and the other points you will address
- You need to include PEE paragraphs, starting with the point in the question
- Link to **your argument** in every point you make
- Your conclusion shouldn't be a shock. It should re-confirm your main point, with no new evidence

To what extent did divisions between parliament and the army lead to the failure of a settlement by 1649?

- **What is the answer?**

- Role of Charles? – failure to accept a settlement?
 - Division between Parliament and New Model Army
 - Radicalism in the NMA?
-
- Four stages of failure to settle
 - Political Presbyterians alienated and politicised the NMA who could work with their Independent allied in parliament
 - Charles' intransigence in refusing to come to settlement – made many in parl and NMA more radical in their approach towards settlement and the king
 - Charles further radicalised the NMA by refusal to accept their moderate Heads of Proposals and starting a Second Civil War
 - Political Presbyterians further alienated the army in continuing to try to negotiate with Charles even after his defeat in the Second Civil War. This forced the army to act against their enemies in Parliament to secure the trial of the king.

To what extent did divisions between parliament and the army lead to the failure of a settlement by 1649?

- **What is the answer?**

- A. Failure to reach a settlement by 1649 was to a large extent due to the divisions between parliament and the army, although there were smaller, contributing factors such as the role of Charles I and radicalism within the New Model Army, which, despite being secondary to these divisions, cannot be ignored in explaining the failure of negotiations for settlement.
- B. Failure to reach a settlement by 1649 was only partially due to the divisions between parliament and the army, and although this did contribute in a minor way, the predominant cause of this failure in 1649 was Charles I's own actions.
- C. Failure of a settlement with the king in 1649 was predominantly caused by radicalism in the New Model Army, and although divisions between parliament and the army contributed to a small extent, they were secondary to the driving force of radicalism which caused the failure of settlement and the Regicide to occur.

Key evidence to use for this question

- Politicisation of the New Model Army
- The Newcastle Propositions, July 1646
- The Heads of the Proposals, July 1647
- Four bills, Nov 1647
- Putney debates – showed radicalism of NMA rank and file and debate over acceptance of grandees Heads of the Proposals, but never resolved so we cannot know the impact this low level radicalism would have had
- Charles I escaped from Hampton Court November 1647, rejects the four bills
- Charles signs the Engagement with the Scots, Dec 1647
- Passage of Vote of No Addresses in Parliament
- Windsor Prayer Meeting, 1648
- Repeal of Vote of No Addresses Aug 1648
- Newport Treaty Sept-Nov 1648
- Remonstrance of the Army
- Prides Purge
- Trial of king

How will it be marked?

- **L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well substantiated judgement. 21-25
- **L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. 16-20
- **L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. 11-15
- **L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. 6-10
- **L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. 1-5

Stuart Britain Course

Key Questions

1. **How far** did the monarchy change?
2. **To what extent** and **why** was power more widely shared during this period?
3. **Why** and with **what results** were there disputes over religion?
4. **How effective** was opposition?
5. **How important** were ideas and ideology?
6. **How important** was the role of key individuals and groups and how were they affected by developments?

Content Revision: How far did the monarchy change?

Monarchy in 1603

A From *De Republica Anglorum* by Sir Thomas Smith (1583).

The king distributes his authority and power in the fashion of five things: in the making of laws and ordinances; in the making of battle and peace with foreign nations; in providing of money for the maintenance of himself and defence against his enemies; in choosing and election of the chief officers and magistrates; and fifthly, in the administration of justice. The first and third are done by the prince [king] in parliament. The second and fourth by the prince [king] himself. The fifth is by the great assize [law courts].

- Also head of the Church of England

Attempts to exploit Charles's weakness during the Long Parliament – radical reforms in government of Church and State

- Following the personal rule, needed to curb the King's capacity to rule in an arbitrary way and save the Church of England from popery
- Removal of unpopular ministers – impeachment of Laud, Hampden, Strafford
- Triennial Act
- Dissolution of Parliament by own consent only
- Illegality of Ship Money, knighthood and forest fines
- Abolition of prerogative courts of Star Chamber, High Commission etc.
- (but these measures did not amount to parliamentary sovereignty – parl control of govt and policies)
- Just trying to prevent repetition of personal rule
- Measures ad hoc
- Charles could withdraw them if he came on better times, he only conceded under duress

The Interregnum

Summary of the constitutions of the Interregnum

- 1** The Commonwealth (the Rump), 1649–53
England was a Republic, governed by a Council of State whose 41 members had been nominated by the New Model Army and were responsible to the House of Commons. There were 34 MPs on the Council. The monarchy, the Lords and the bishops had been abolished. The MPs were originally members of the Long Parliament, elected in 1640. Ireland and Scotland, both of which were rebellious in 1649, had no representation.
- 2** Barebones Parliament, 1653 (otherwise known as the Nominated Assembly or the Parliament of Saints)
The Army asked the Independent Churches to submit the names of members of what was originally intended to be a constituent assembly which would propose a constitution. The Army selected 140 members, who immediately declared themselves to be a Parliament. Ireland returned five members and Scotland six members – the first occasion that these areas had been represented at Westminster.
- 3** The Instrument of Government, 1653–7
A single chamber Parliament composed of 400 MPs from England and Wales, plus 30 each from Ireland and Scotland. Executive power held by a lord protector and a council of state. Parliament to meet at least once every three years for at least three months. Votes to men with property of at least £200 in value. Constituencies redefined to reflect distribution of population.
- 4** The Humble Petition and Advice, 1657–9
The offer of the crown was rejected by Cromwell, who remained Lord Protector and now could nominate his successor. The Privy Council was restored, also a second chamber of 40 members who were appointed for life by the Protector in Council. The second chamber could veto the proposals of the Lower House. Otherwise the provisions of the Instrument of Government stood.

The Restoration Settlement

In June 1661 the Commons introduced a bill that would allow them, through commissioners, to remove men from the 1640s and 1650s and appoint 'loyal' or 'well-affected' men. The Commons' commissioners carried out a sweeping purge. Local government returned to the hands of the traditional ruling elite. The Act for the Safety and Preservation of His Majesty's Person and Government cancelled all ordinances; that is, any acts of Parliament that had not received the royal assent. This did mean, however, that some of the parliamentary legislation of 1641 that had sought to limit the Crown's powers was to stand:

- **Abolition of Star Chamber:** Star Chamber was a prerogative court that had been used by Charles I to try some of his leading critics.
- **Abolition of high commission:** Church court used by Charles I to enforce anti-Calvinism.
- **Abolition of ship money (and other financial reforms):** Charles I had raised money on his prerogative through 11 years of rule without parliament, 1629 to 1640.
- **The Triennial Act:** Passed in 1641 to ensure the monarch called a parliament at least every three years.
- **Exclusion of bishops from Lords:** This was to prevent a core group of support for the monarch.

Soon, however, the Act excluding the bishops was repealed. The presence of the bishops in the Lords gave the Crown an influential group of supporters. Some church courts, but not the High Commission, were brought back. In 1664 a remodelled Triennial Act removed the compulsory element of the Crown calling a Parliament every three years replacing it with the hope he would call a Parliament *at least* every three years. Sessions were also not to have a specified minimum duration. Even the Convention's Indemnity Act and land settlement were reviewed by the Cavalier Parliament. Only the intervention of Charles, who realised the unrest this might create, stopped the Cavalier Parliament proceeding.

The Cavalier Parliament strengthened the position of Charles II:

- **Press:** Press censorship formalised by the 1662 Licensing Act. 1660 proclamation to burn Milton's *Defence of the People of England* (1650) justifying regicide. Printer of the 1663 tract *Mene Tekel* that argued that there was nothing in the Bible that prevented resistance to a tyrant was hanged, disembowelled and quartered.
- **Petitioning:** An act to prevent mass petitioning. Three JPs or a county grand jury were needed to authorise any petition with only 20 or more signatures. Furthermore only 10 people could present the petition.

- Chapter 6 Fore
- **Popery:** The Act for the Safety and Preservation of His Majesty made it punishable to accuse the King of trying to bring in popery or stirring up hatred of the monarch.
 - **Parliament:** Parliament could not legislate without the monarch.

Parliament did not retreat on the financial measures of 1641, recognising that Parliament's real power over the Crown was financial. The reinforcement of Charles's annual income of £1.2 million per annum with the Hearth Tax (1662) still did not prove enough, especially under the pressures of the Dutch Wars. The limited financial settlement made Charles reliant on Parliament.

The failures of the Restoration settlement were the basis for continuing problems in Charles's attempts to consolidate his rule to 1667 and arguably for the Stuarts until their removal in 1688.

After the Exclusion Crisis

Charles's exploitation of the prerogative

From 1676 Charles II appointed judges 'during the King's pleasure' rather than while 'they shall do good' and from this point he removed 11 judges. In 1684 Charles did not call a Parliament which he should have done under the Triennial Act.

Local government was also manipulated. In the summer of 1681, many Whigs were purged from the commissions of peace and lieutenancies. Town charters were also used as a means to limit the influence of the Whigs and dissenters in their traditional urban strongholds. In December 1681, Charles had demanded a new charter for the City of London giving him the power, which he finally secured in 1683, to appoint the Lord Mayor, sheriffs and all other major office-holders. The inability of London to defend its charter led others to not defend theirs and this increased the influence of Tories in urban areas. Between 1681 and 1685 51 new charters were issued and 47 prepared when Charles died. By these means Tories sought to control local government, have more influence over parliamentary elections and restrict dissent. For Mullet (1993) 'English municipal government had been brought within the parameters of Tory absolutism'. Linked to this the judiciary became dominated by Tories.

Weiser in *Charles II and the Politics of Access* (2003) has argued that political concerns, not personality, brought Charles II to initially favour open access as a means to aid the reunification of the nation. When his political agenda changed so did the politics of access. It became more limited and Charles used it as a political tool to galvanise supporters and dishearten opponents.

After the Glorious Revolution

The position and powers of monarchy after 1688

As a result of the revolution, and particularly the financial revolution, the monarchy became more dependent on Parliament. For Speck (1989) 'In 1689 parliament was finally transformed from an event into an institution'. William's wars against France reinforced this dependence. In the period after 1688 the following developments changed the position and powers of monarchy:

- Crown income becomes national income raised and managed by Parliament.
- Crown needs parliamentary support.
- Parliament begins to oversee foreign policy.
- Crown accepted the need to have regular parliaments.
- Crown had to accept ministers who could get them parliamentary support.

In this period the powers of the Crown were extended through:

- prorogation and dissolution
- line of succession
- leadership of the Church
- more control over local government
- Whig leaders removed
- persecution
- propaganda
- healthy finance position
- an army of 10,000.