PREFACE

In a bid to standardize higher education in the country, the University Grants Commission (UGC) has introduced Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) based on five types of courses viz. *core, general elective, ability and skill enhancement* for graduate students of all programmes at Honours level. This brings in the semester pattern which finds efficacy in sync with credit system, credit transfer, comprehensive continuous assessments and a graded pattern of evaluation. The objective is to offer learners ample flexibility to choose from a wide gamut of courses, as also to provide them lateral mobility between various educational institutions in the country where they can carry their acquired credits.

UGC (Open and Distance Learning (ODL) Regulations, 2017 have mandated compliance with CBCS for U.G. programmes for all the HEIs in this mode. Welcoming this paradigm shift in higher education, Netaji Subhas Open University (NSOU) has resolved to adopt CBCS from the academic session 2021-22 at the Bachelors Degree Programme (BDP) level. The present syllabus, framed in the spirit of syllabi recommended by UGC, lays due stress on all aspects envisaged in the curricular framework of the apex body on higher education. It will be imparted to learners over the six semesters of the Programme.

Self Learning Material (SLMs) are the mainstay of Student Support Services (SSS) of an Open University. From a logistic point of view, NSOU has embarked upon CBCS presently with SLMs in English / Bengali. Eventually, the English version SLMs will be translated into Bengali too, for the benefit of learners. As always, all of our teaching faculties contributed in this process. In addition to this we have also requisitioned the services of best academics in each domain in preparation of the new SLMs. I am sure they will be of commendable academic support. We look forward to proactive feedback from all stakeholders who will participate in the teaching-learning based on these study materials. It has been a very challenging task well executed, and I congratulate all concerned in the preparation of these SLMs.

I wish the venture a grand success.

Professor (Dr.) Ranjan Chakraborty
Vice-Chancellor

NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY
Under Graduate Degree Programme
Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)
Subject : Honours in History (HHI)

Course : CC VIII : Rise of the Modern West-II
Course Code : CC-HI-08

First Print : March, 2023

Printed in accordance with the regulations of the Distance Education
Bureau of the University Grants Commission.

NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY
Under Graduate Degree Programme
Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)
Subject : Honours in History (HHI)
Course Code: CC-HI-08

: Course Writers :
Units 1-8: Professor Chandan Basu
Professor of History
NSOU SoSS
Units 9-24: Dr. Arunima Roychaudhuri
Assistant Professor of History
Sundarban Mahavidyalaya

: Course Editor :
Dr. Ritu Mathur Mitra
Associate Professor of History
SoSS, NSOU

: Format Editing :
Dr Ritu Mathur Mitra
Associate Professor of History
SoSS, NSOU

NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY

UG : Rise of the Modern West-II (HHI)

Course : Rise of the Modern West-II
Course Code : CC-HI-08

Module I: 17th century European Crisis

Unit 1 ❑ Decline of the Mediterranean Economy 7-16

Unit 2 ❑ Decline of Spain 17-33

Unit 3 ❑ Decline of Italy 34-43

Unit 4 ❑ Nature and the Extent of the Crisis: Economic, Social and Political Dimensions 44-71

Unit 5 ❑ The Thirty Years War 72-99

Module II: The English Revolution

Unit 6 ❑ Major issues 100-116

Unit 7 ❑ Fermentation of Ideas: Political and intellectual currents 117-135

Unit 8 ❑ Commonwealth and Protectorate 136-150

Unit 9 ❑ Restoration of 1660 151-159

Unit 10 ❑ Socio-Economic Changes 160-169

Unit 11 ❑ The Revolution of 1688 170-180

Unit 12 ❑ Consequences 181-188

Unit 13 ❑ Intellectual and Cultural Trends 189-196

Module III: Rise of Modern Science in relation to European society from the Renaissance to the 17th century

Unit 14 ❑ Origins 197-204

Unit 15 ❑ Social Context of the Modern Science 205-213

Unit 16 ❑ Major Developments 214-223

Unit 17 ❑ The Formulation of Scientific Method 224-231

Unit 18 ❑ Science and Religion 232-239

Module IV: Mercantilism and European Economics: 17th and 18th Centuries

Unit 19 ❑ Origins 240-246

Unit 20 ❑ The Theory of Mercantilism 247-254

Unit 21 ❑ (a) Mercantilism in Action;
(b) Rejection of Mercantilism 255-265

Module V: European Politics in the 18th century

Unit 22 ❑ (a) Parliamentary monarchy;
(b) Patterns of Absolutism in Europe 266-274

Module VI: Political and Economic Issues in the American Revolution

Unit 23 ❑ Understanding the American Revolution – Political and Economic issues 275-286

Module VII: Preludes to the Industrial Revolution

Unit 24 ❑ Causal Origin of Industrial Revolution 287-296

Module I: 17th century European Crisis

Unit 1 ❑ Decline of the Mediterranean Economy

Structure

1.0 Objectives

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Decline of the Mediterranean Economy: An Overview

1.3 Conclusion

1.4 Model Questions

1.5 Suggested Readings

1.0 Objectives

- The present unit aims to discuss the decline of the Mediterranean economy in the 17th century.
- The causes and impact of the decline of the Mediterranean economy will also be discussed.
- This unit will contextualize the decline of the Mediterranean economy in the crisis of the European economy of the 17th century.

1.1 Introduction

There is a general agreement among the historians that the long domination of the Mediterranean on the European economy since the dawn of the civilization in Europe fell into deep crisis with the rise of the Atlantic in the early modern era: the result of the fall of the Mediterranean was the overall decline of the Mediterranean economy. The European economy was primarily divided into three economic zones in the early modern era: the Mediterranean zone, the Atlantic Zone and the Baltic Zone. These three zones were interconnected with each other through trading

networks. However, Europe witnessed a shift of economic balance from the Mediterranean region to the Atlantic region after the discovery of a direct oceanic link with America. The Mediterranean economic and trading zone was one of the most vibrant commercial regions in Europe since the time of the Greco-Roman time. In the 16th century, the economic and trading activities of the Mediterranean region was still impressive. It had cities like Florence, Venice, Genoa, Milan etc. The approximate population of the region was 60 million in the 16th century. There was adequate development of food production and manufacturing sectors in the region, especially in northern Italy. There were two types of urban centres in early modern northern Italy. The first type of cities were chiefly manufacturing centres. Florence and Milan represented such cities. The second type of the cities were famous for industrial and maritime activities, and shipbuilding. Venice and Genoa were such cities during the period under review. Outside Italy, Ragusa–the major port city of Sicily–specialized in maritime activities. The bulk amount of salt, grain and wool was traded from the port of Ragusa. The Mediterranean region was dependent on the grain-producing regions of Europe for the regular supply of grain. The ships of Venice, Genoa and Ragusa were specially engaged in importing a bulk amount of grain to Italy. The usual items were wheat, barley and millets used for bread and biscuit. It is quite obvious that the entire trading network was interconnected and the region-specific specializations were developed to meet the demands of the other regions. It was due to different reasons the economy of the Mediterranean region started declining in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. In the present unit, an attempt will be made to analyse the fundamental aspects of the decline of the Mediterranean economy during the period under review (Munck 1990, 117-118; Rich and Wilson 1967, 155-156).

1.2 Decline of the Mediterranean Economy: An Overview

In the 16th century, the great cities of the Mediterranean region–Venice, Milan, Florence, Genoa and others–were the prime centres of the economic activities connecting Europe and the Levant (especially Constantinople and Cairo) apart from producing industrial goods. However, this prosperity did not continue in the last half of the 16th century. The first sign of recession was first felt in the field of agriculture.

The years between 1580 and 1620 saw the initial slowdown of agricultural production. It was followed by the development of commercial stagnation and financial uncertainty in the Mediterranean cities. There was also a drop in urban industry and even population during the same period. All these changes in the Mediterranean economy were an indication of the beginning ofa long-term crisis in the region's political economy. The Mediterranean region had for long been the principal centre of sophisticated production and specialized financial services; the economic crunch transformed it into a mere producer of certain goods for the European market (Munck 1990, 117-118). It was the most decisive moment in the economy of the Mediterranean region: it turned an advanced economic zone into a relatively backward one. The north and north-west Europe would become the new dominant regions of 17th century Europe.

There were multiple manifestations of the decline of the Mediterranean economy during the period under review. The slow but definitive process of economic decline in the Italian peninsula had begun in much earlier period. In 15th century, Italy witnessed the rise of *Signorie* and the fall of communes. It created social deterioration by detaching the masses from the administration. Family tradition and political influence suppressed the individual talent and initiative in the new condition. The immediate effect was that the people started considering craft and mercantile activities as socially or culturally low menial occupations. However, though not immediately, this newly developed mentality had long-term negative impact on the economic prosperity of Italy. Italy was able to retain its economic prosperity until the end of the 15th century. The situation began to change in the years between 1494 and 1538. During this period, the Italian state faced foreign aggression. The major European powers like Spain, France and Germany became involved in the conflict in the soil of Italy. This international warfare badly affected the peace, stability and consequently prosperity of the entire region. The war was associated with famines, epidemics, destruction of property and disruption of trade and commerce. All these factors were collectively responsible for the economic decline of the Mediterranean region largely (Cipolla 1976, 236).

The decline of the economy of the Mediterranean region was manifested in the textile industry. For example, Brescia's production of woollen cloth drastically fell

from 8000 pieces in 1500 to 1000 pieces in 1540. The towns like Como and Pavia also faced economic recession. Pavia also experienced fall of population from about 16,000 at the end of the century to fewer than 7,000 in 1529. Florence was also no exception. The population of the city was reduced to 60,000 in 1530-40 from 72,000 at the end of the 15th century. The number of woollens workshops fell from about 270 to few more than 60, and the annual production of woollens from about 25,000 pieces to a few hundred. However, with the restoration of peace in the middle of the 16th century, the production of woollen cloth began to revive. Bergamo increased its production of woollen cloth from 7000-8000 pieces in 1540 to 26,500 pieces in 1596. Florence produced 14,700 pieces of woollen cloth in 1553; in 1560, it was 30,000. However, these signs of recovery did not ensure the removal of profound elements of crisis from the Italian economy. In fact, the old structure of the economy was restored along traditional way. The guilds achieved new strength and adopted all possible measures to prevent competition. This conservative attitude blocked innovative aptitude in the economic structure of Italy. It made Italy less efficient in the changing international market of Europe as far as competition was concerned. The internal market of Italy was limited. Italy's economic prosperity was primarily dependent on the export of commodities in the various parts of Europe. This dependence on the export economy of Italy came to be questioned by the rise of the manufacturing sector in England and the Low Countries. These regions of 16th century Europe developed their production on new scales. The products of England or the Low Countries competitively penetrated in the international market against the Italian products. Until the end of the 16th century, the Italian manufacturers could not realize the gravity of the changing situation. The 17th century witnessed the full advent of the non-Italian commodities in the market of Europe. It created deep crisis in the economy of the entire Mediterranean region(Cipolla 1976, 236-239).

There were other reasons behind the decline of the Mediterranean economy also. The decline of the import of silver from America to Spain in the second decade of the 17th century affected the condition of the Italian financial market. It was because of the fact that the Genoese bankers were for a long period deeply involved in the financial transactions of Spanish government. After 1620, the economic crisis of Spain took an acute form due to the uncertainty of import of silver from American mines. Consequently, Spain failed to meet its various international commitments.

Moreover, the internal economic structure of Spain was weak and the establishment of an overseas empire did not make it as economically powerful. The north European states took the advantages of the decline of the Spanish economy in 17th century. The records of the *Casa de Contratacion* (a government trade council) in Seville do not indicate more than a moderate decline in the volume of the Spanish-American trade in the period 1620-50. However, the nature, value and place of origin of the commodities altered significantly in favour of other European countries (especially the French), at the expense of the domestic Spanish economy. Nevertheless, there were even deeper changes within the Mediterranean region itself affecting the prosperity of the Italian cities. The outside competition reduced the scale of trade and manufacturing capability of the cities like Venice. The early c. 1600 witnessed the decline of the prosperity of Venice. Two factors were immanent in the decline of this city. In the earlier century, the growing piracy and Ottoman turbulence increased the cost of city's defence. After 1600, it faced the British and Dutch competition increasingly. A city like Venice fell into deep crisis due to these two factors. There was shortage of timber for shipbuilding in Venice. The city was forced to impose restriction on the foreign merchants during the same period under review. The Venetian merchants were also instructed not to hire ships from the foreign merchants. In the second quarter of the 17th century, new developments took place. The English textile products flooded the traditional Venetian markets on the one hand; the Dutch low-cost shipping, established dominance in the Mediterranean because of its control over grain and naval products of Baltic. Both the British and Dutch merchants used all possible means including illegal and fraudulent ways to infiltrate in the Venetian market. Moreover, the north European traders enjoyed cheaper labour in comparison with the Venetian labour. It reduced the production cost of the north European products. The emerging economy of the north European states–England, France and the Netherlands–also started attracting the skilled artisans for production of luxury soaps, high quality glass and mirror, paper and cloth. It was a challenge to the Venetian entrepreneurs. The old spice trade operated in the Mediterranean region was also in the crisis as there was new route in the north western Europe. Despite all these setbacks, after 1669, the Venetian economy recovered largely. It was able to maintain its trade, employment and consumption pattern in the second half of the 17th century. According to the modern estimate, by the end of the 17th century the Venetian

economy was in many respects similar to what it had been in 1539, before its great boom period: prosperous but not spectacular in any way (Munck 1990, 117-121).

The other regions of Italy faced greater economic problems in 17th century in comparison with Venice. The primary difficulty of Italy's economic structure was that it did not have adequate raw materials for industrial production. Another shortcoming of the Italian economy was that the labour cost was higher than the north western states. Consequently, it became difficult for the Italian manufacturers to compete with their French, English, or Dutch competitors. The higher labour cost in Italy increased the price of its products. The result was that the north European states gradually captured the market driving out the Italian products. It had a long-term effect on the basic structure of Italian economy: in the end of the 17th century, Italy became the exporter of the raw materials like wine, oil, silk, dyestuffs and fruit and importer of the manufactured commodities. This transformation from advanced economic zone based on manufacturing sector to a relatively backward region relying only on exporting raw materials was the principal crux of the economic crisis of the Mediterranean region in the 17th century (Munck 1990, 121).

Fernand Braudel and Immanuel Wallerstein interpret this decline of the Mediterranean region because of the shift of epicentre of the economic activities of Europe from Venice and Antwerp to Amsterdam in early and mid-16th century and to London in the later part of the 17th century. Christopher F. Black argues that there was definitely a shift of the European economic gravity from south to north in 17th century. However, there were also signs of adjustment, realignment and recovery. It was not at all a total decline of the Mediterranean economy during the period under review (Black 2001, 32). It is also pointed out that there was expansion of market and fairs along with the growth of towns in 16th century and in the 17th century. The urban centres like Bari, Lecce, Taranto, Matera and Barletta were benefitted from this wave of urbanization: capital investment came from Venice, Genoa and Tuscany. The rural economy was boosted from the fairs. It increased the financial transaction and commodity exchanges in rural Italy. It is undeniable that the Italian traders lost substantially their command over the international trade. However, recent researches show that the internal economy of Italy in 17th century was able to retain its economic prosperity largely due to the rise of comparatively lesser known urban or semi-urban

areas. These new smaller centres of economic activity in Italy compensated largely the financial crisis of the bigger cities. This rise of the smaller towns and rural areas as new centres of economic activity in 17th century Italy contributed prosperity to the family-based production system. The families, which had adequate female labour, were the chief beneficiaries of the changing pattern of the Italian economy. Historians like C. M. Belfanti characterize it as 'rural decentralisation of manufacture'or 'proto-industrialization'. The Duchy of Mantua, the Republic of Genoa, or the Bresciano under the Venetian Republic experienced this new system of production. Even the wealthy urban merchants of Mantua and Genoa developed new production centres in the rural areas in order to avoid high labour cost in the urban areas and the strict control of guilds. The plague epidemic of 1579–80 caused many Genoese silk craftsmen to flee Genoa; they remained in the inland villages to create a rural silk processing and weaving industry that survived many vicissitudes till the eighteenth century. Small landholders also became weavers in the changing context. The urban investors wanted freedom from the control of the guild. It led them to search for new lands in rural areas where they might get land at low cost and labour at cheap rate. The result was that there was the development of a new pattern of industrial production in different areas of rural Italy like Bergamo valley, Bresciano valley, the Camonica valley, the Trompia valley and the Sabbia valley. These areas produced cloth, iron, pots, horseshoes, cuirasses firearms, agricultural implements, wires, nails and steel. Lake Garda, situated at the western shore of Italy and poor in food production, developed flax spinning. In various parts of rural Italy, there was development of paper production. The Italian manufacturers were able to diversify their production base substantially in the late 16th and early 17th centuries. For example, there was development of cotton manufacturing in Lombard areas around Gallarete and Busto Arizio; cordage and hemp sailcloth in the Cento region between Bologna and Ferrara; hat making from willow shavings in the Pio family's little seigneury of Carpi; hemp production in the Bolognese contado areas around Budrio and Castel S. Pietro (Black 2001, 33-36).

From this analysis, it is clear that the so-called proto-industrialization in rural Italy played significant role in boosting the income not only of the merchants but also of the rural producers-artisans and peasants. The rural industrial sector quickly achieved considerable importance in the changing paradigm of the Italian economy.

It is little bit difficult to assess the degree and extent of changes brought about by proto-industrialization due to lack of precise statistical evidences. Nevertheless, some efforts have been made to make a measurable assessment of the economic changes taking place in 17th century Italy. For example, it is estimated that there were 10,000 iron workers in the Camonica valley in 1609-10; over 7000 people were producing 60,000 cloths in Busto Arizio in 1767. Del Fabbro-a Friulian entrepreneur- employed 11,000 weavers on looms producing flax and hemp cloth at the end of the 17th century. In Como, about 18,000 women were involved in the domestic silk industry. In 1620, Bergamo had 84 mines, 11 blast furnaces and 100 forges.The Camonica valley kept up 90-100 forges throughout the period from the 1560s to the 1780s.These facts indicate that rural Italy was being increasingly interlinked with the urban economy of Italy and the international trade in multiple ways. It brings us to the question of material culture and consumerism in 17th century Italy. There is no evidence that Italy experienced any decline of consumer culture during the period under review. Visual evidences suggest that expanding prosperity was visible not only in the large cities like Venice, Milan or Genoa, but also in the smaller urban centres like Prato. There was increasing desire for comparatively higher lifestyle and improved mode of living in both urban and rural Italy. The movement of traders, investors and even human resources between urban and rural areas was another important aspect of the 17th century Italian economy. The so-called proto-industrialization provided an opportunity to the rural workforce, especially the female workforce, to get involved in the sophisticated production process. It brought urban taste and culture to the rural population. It created awareness in the rural society about the existence of higher living standard in the urban areas making the rural folks aspirant to achieve this (Black 2001, 36-41).

1.3 Conclusion

From this analysis, it is clear that despite the shift of the epicentre of the European economy from the Mediterranean region to the Atlantic region, the economic decline was not as much as it is conventionally thought. It is true that the new economic powers of Europe in 17th century were the Netherlands, France and England. This century witnessed the rise of the north western Europe in the changing

global economic and political structure. The economy of the Mediterranean region was not in a position to compete with the economy of the Dutch Republic or England during the 17th century. However, it is equally true that there was no overall decline of the Mediterranean economy due to the rise of the Atlantic economy. The major centres of the Mediterranean economy, especially the cities and towns of Italy, continuously adjusted with the new situation, invented innovative investment strategy and carried out fresh production process. Though the Mediterranean region definitely lost the economic and commercial leadership in Europe in 17th century with the rise of the north western Europe, nevertheless, it did not mean the end of prosperity of the region completely. On the contrary, it survived meaningfully through the mobilization of capital and human resources between urban and rural areas. The creation of new wealth and portfolio diversification essentially in rural Italy, along with a visible material culture, was the key to the successful survival of the region's economic prosperity in spite of the rise of English or Dutch economy. The exploitation of cheap labour in rural areas of Italy and expansion of a consumer culture consolidated the process of portfolio diversification. Therefore, we may conclude that the economy of the Mediterranean region suffered some losses in 17th century, but not as much as it was once envisaged.

1.4 Model Questions

1. Do you think that the Mediterranean region witnessed a drastic decline of its economy inthe 17th century?
2. Write briefly on the aspects of the decline of the Mediterranean economy in 17th century.
3. Explain the decline in the textile industry.
4. Were there any signs of recovery in the Mediterranean economy or was it a total decline?

1.5 Suggested Readings

Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson and James Robinson. "The Rise of Europe:

Atlantic Trade, Institutional Change, and Economic Growth". *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 95, No. 3 (Jun., 2005), pp. 546-579.

Black, Christopher F. *Early Modern Italy. A Social History*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Cameron, Euan (Ed). *Early Modern Europe: An Oxford History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Cipolla, Carlo M. *Before the Industrial Revolution: European Society and Economy, 1000-1700*. USA: W.W. Norton & Company, 1976.

Cipolla, Carlo M. (Ed.). 1979. *The Fontana Economic History of Europe: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Great Britain: Collins/Fontana Books, 1979.

Duplessis, Robert S. *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Koenigsberger, H.G: *Early Modern Europe, 1500 – 1789*. England: Pearson Education Limited, 1987.

Munck, Thomas.*History of Europe. Seventeenth Century Europe 1598-1700. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598 – 1700.* USA: Macmillan Education, 1990.

Musgrave, Peter. *The Early Modern European Economy*. London: Macmillan, 1999.

Miller, John. *Early Modern Europe, 1450-1750*. UK: CUP, 2017.

Prak, Maarten (Ed.). *Early Modern Capitalism: Economic and social change in Europe, 1400-1800*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Rich, R.R and C.H. Wilson. *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, Vol IV. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Vittorio, Antonio Di (Ed.). *An Economic History of Europe: From Expansion to Development*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. *Cambridge History of Europe: Early Modern Europe, 1450 – 1789*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Zanden, Jan Luiten van. *The Long Road to the Industrial Revolution: The European Economy in a Global Perspective, 1000-1800*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Unit 2 ❑ Decline of Spain

Structure

2.0 Objectives

2.1 Introduction

2.2 The Decline of Spain in the 17th Century: Historical Debates

2.3 Conclusion

2.4 Model Questions

2.5 Suggested Readings

2.0 Objectives

- The present unit intends to present an overview of the decline of Spain in the 17th century.
- The learners will be given an idea of the different aspects of the decline of Spain.
- The historiographical debate on the question of the decline of Spain will also be analyzed in this unit.

2.1 Introduction

The history of Spain is extremely interesting. Spain had been a relatively poor region in Europe in the medieval period. Spain did not even hold any significant position in the European politics. Nevertheless, with the discovery of new maritime route thorough Atlantic Ocean for reaching America brought unusual prosperity for Spain. Spain emerged as a global super power in 16th century Europe from a mere economic and political position. The primary factor behind the rise of Spain in 16th century was its command over the American mines of precious metals. The trade was expanded along with new routes and new ports. There was increase of both population and price in Spain as well as in entire Europe. However, the prosperity of Spain did not last for long. The economic epicentre of Europe gradually moved towards North Western Europe–the region dominated by England, France and the

Netherlands. Spain experienced decline of its dominance over the European politics and economy. In this unit, we will try to understand the decline of Spain in the changing political and economic perspective of Europe in the 17th century.

2.2 The Decline of Spain in the 17th Century: Historical Debates

Historians, especially the economic historians, have long been concerned with the question of the decline of Spain. In the mid-19th century, the Spanish Romantic thinkers first paid attention to the question specifically: why did Spain fail to sustain its glorious past? What were the factors behind the fall of Spain from its golden age? The present troubled condition of Spain provided impetus to find out the factors responsible for its decline to an obscure regional power from one of the first global super power. In the English-speaking world, Earl J. Hamilton powerfully argues that there was a clear decline of the Spanish economy during the period under review. In 1961, the historian John H. Elliott develops a coherent argument about the decline of Spain in 17th century in his research paper titled 'The Decline of Spain'. In this paper published in the *Past & Present,* No. 20 (Nov. 1961), he tries to analyse the question of the decline of Spain in 17th century in detail. In analysing the factors behind the decline of Spain during the period under review, Elliott seeks answer not in the simple explanation of the fall of the import of American silver. Rather, he makes effort to understand the question of decline in the internal political and economic structure of contemporary Spain in general and Castile in particular. The expansion of Spain as an imperial power was made possible due to the contribution of Castile in the 16th century. Since the late 16th century, the economy of Castile had been deteriorating at a faster pace with multiple manifestations. The decline of Spain in the 17th century could be explained from two different plane: first, the economic regression of Spain during the period; second, the transformation of Spain from a major imperial power of the 16th century to a mere regional entity in the 17th century. It is needless to point out that these two are interrelated with each other. If we consider the foreign policy of Spain in the 16th and 17th century, we will see that its very aim was to expand the Spanish dominance and influence in the international politics and to destroy the heresy. Nevertheless, it had its cost. Philip II spent

approximately 13 million ducats in a year between 1593 and 1597; the ministers of Philip IV calculated the sum of 13 million ducats in 1636 for the same purpose. Now the question arises: where did the money come from? In the 16th and 17th centuries, Spanish economy the answer was simple: it was the Castilian tax payers who had to pay for the maintenance as well as expansion of the Spanish imperial dream.In fact, the real foundation of the Spanish power was the Castilian economy and military power. To be more precise, Spain was dependent on Castile in three different areas: firstly, the Castilian tax payers were the primary source of Spanish war expenditure; secondly, the Castilians supplied the main army to Spain; thirdly, the Castilian possession of mines in South America provided additional support to Spanish treasury.

It implies that there were three basic factors behind the prosperity of Castile: population, productivity and overseas wealth. Let us examine these three factors separately. As far as the demographic structure of Castile is concerned, both the total number and density of population were on the higher side in the 16th century. In the middle of the 16th century, the total population of Castile was about 6.5 million while the figure of the entire Iberian Peninsula was about 7.5 million excluding Portugal. If we consider the density of population in Castile, there were 22 habitants to the square kilometre in 1594 as against only 13.6 in the Crown of Aragon. In the early 1590s, the central region of Castile accounted for 30.9 percent of the total population of Spain. It clearly indicates that this particular region was heavily populated rather than the other areas of Spain. The arid land and pastoral economy of Castile were however not in a position to feed this over populous region. The South American settlement of Spain opened up new opportunities to those Castilians who were ready to take risk in a completely unknown region. The daredevil mentality of these people was one of the causes behind the successful establishment of the Spanish Empire in South America. However, it is difficult to precisely estimate the total number of immigrations from Castile to South America during this period nevertheless one rough figure is 150,000 up to 1550. It is already noted that Spain had a clear dependence on the Castilian population for its army. In other words, Spain recruited most of the soldiers from Castile. It became increasingly difficult for the provincial governors to recruit fresh blood for the Spanish army in the 17th century. The primary reason behind this difficulty in recruiting new men for army was the massive

internal migration: The years between 1530 and 1594 witnessed the drift of population from the rural areas to the urban one. There was a continuous migration of population from North Castile to central Castile during the period under review. It clearly indicates that two types of migration took place in the 16th and 17th centuries Spain: firstly, the migration from Spain to the New World; secondly, the migration within Spain. Andalusia became the El Dorado for those Castilians who failed to cross the Atlantic. Seville – the gateway to Atlantic–increased its population from 45,000 in 1530 to 90,000 in 1594. We must also note that the several northern towns like Medina del Campo recorded a marked decline of population(Elliott 1961, 52-59).

Two important events took place in Spain during the same period. In 1599 and 1600, Castile and Andalusia suffered heavily from plague and famine. Though it is difficult to get precise statistical evidence about the number of death toll, nevertheless, we can say that both the plague and famine badly affected the demographic structure of these two provinces. The second event that started affecting the population of structure of Spain was the expulsion of Moriscos (The Moriscos were descendants of Spain's Muslim population that had converted to Christianity by coercion or by royal decree in the early 16th century). We are also not sure about the actual figure regarding it. However, according to M.Lapeyre's estimate, some 275,000 Moriscos were expelled from Spain between 1609 and 1614. Of these 275,000, Castile and Andalusia contributed approximately 90,000. The expulsion of the Moriscos from Castile definitely affected its economy. It needs to be noted that the Moriscos were generally urban dwellers and engaged in menial tasks in Castile. Their expulsion from the province naturally created a vacuum in the Castilian economy. The Castilian economy and population again suffered from catastrophic plague in 1647 and 1650. All these events badly affected the Spanish recruitment of men for its army in the province. During the same period, the Castilian economy also faced difficulties. The researchers show that the economy of Castile passed through a phase of expansion between 1500 and 1548. The annual average price rise in the province was 2.8 percent between 1501 and 1562. Three factors played an important role behind this steady price rise: increasing aristocratic expenditure, mounting debts of Charles V (through the distribution of *juros* or credit bonds) and escalating demands of food from Castile's growing population. The Castilian fair also integrated its economy with the economy of North Europe and Italy through a complicated network of

reciprocal obligation. This boom in the economy of Castile with a continuous price hike, which was essentially a result of the export trade, came to an end in the middle of 16th century because of a particular dramatic decision taken by the government. The government assumed that the increasing export of Castilian products provided stimulation to the hike of commodity prices. Therefore, the government decided to impose prohibition on the export of Castilian products and allowed only the import of the foreign products in order to keep the prices beneath a certain level. This decision soon proved to be disastrous for the economy of Castile. Moreover, the lack of investment as well as absence of adequate demand in the home market further deteriorated the condition of the Castile industries.

The erroneous agrarian policy of Castile also aggravated the crisis. It only encouraged sheep farming instead of cultivation. This created deep imbalance within the economy of Castile. The royal administration of Castile also fixed the maximum price of corn. It was another cause of the misery of the farmers. This short-sighted agrarian policy made Castile dependent on northern and eastern Europe for supply of grain.It became clear that the Castilian agriculture was incapable of meeting the growing demand of food. Interestingly, there was expansion of cultivation in south Spain after the middle of the 16th century; however, it met the demands of America instead of the home market of Spain. Possibly, the smaller landholders of Castile were the hardest hit; the big landlords certainly found some escape routes.It possibly created depopulation in rural Castile. The village of Castile was truly unprotected. There was communal indebtedness in the Castilian villages, and the situation became worst when some villagers fled from their ancestral land. There were two options before the deserted villagers: either they could go to big urban centres or they could become vagabonds (Elliott 1961, 59-65).

The traditional society of Castile was unlike the English or the Dutch society an almost perfect military society. Essentially based on military ethics and crusading zeal, the Castilian society was incapable of developing so-called capitalist spirit in the 17th century.Instead of investing capital in commercial enterprise, which would obviously involve some amount of risk, the Castilians preferred to invest their money especially in *juros* or government bonds. Under the established credit system, the wealthy Castilians invested their money at the interest rate of 5%, 7% and 10%. While the municipal corporations and crown offered 7% and 10% rate of interest

respectively, the lending of money to a private person (*censos*) would offer the 5% rate of interest.*Censos* and *juros* were avenues for investment in safer areas rather than relatively risky regions of commercial enterprises. Agriculture, industry and trade failed to attract investment in Castile because of the attractive rate of interest offered by *censos* and *juros*. It undoubtedly largely debilitated the economic growth of Castile in the 17th century. The historians also note that the cultural and educational contacts of the Spaniards with the other European countries were also weakened during the 17th century. The Spanish turn towards the Catholic theology under Philip II certainly blocked the libertarian ideological development, scientific ethos and technical experiments. The conservative religious culturalism sponsored by Catholicism in the late 16th century and entire 17th century Spain could be considered as a kind of obstacle for the development of scientific mentality. It was one of the primary reasons behind the decline of Spain during the period under review (Elliott 1961, 65-68).

It is clear from the analysis offered by Elliott that the fall of Castile contributed to the general decline of Spain in the 17th century. Castile lost its demographic and productive vitality, which seemed to be catastrophic for the Spanish economy. After 1601, the Castilian and Andalusia products started losing demands in America causing less supply of silver remittance to Spain. It further deteriorated the condition of the Spanish economy. The result of the entire development of the economy, society and culture of Castile towards a particular direction was thatforeign merchants and foreign capital were the principal beneficiaries: the Genoese, the Portuguese Jews and the heretical Dutch. The foreign bankers controlled the Crown's finance. The Castilian economy went under the domination of the foreign merchants. The Dutch were successful in increasing their presence significantly in the overseas trade and empire of both Spain and Portugal. The remittance of the American silver to Spain was decreasing during the period under review. The silver remittances to the Crown at the end of Philip II's reign averaged about two million ducats a year. In 1614-15 and 1616-16, this figure was below million ducats and in 1620, it was as low as 800,000 ducats. The value of the Spanish currency was unstable and falling also. Olivares–the Spanish Prime Minister between 1621 and 1643–tried his best to control the situation. However, he failed. He tried to extract money from the privileged and the exempted category. In the case of the Castilian nobles, this policy

proved less fatal. However, the fiscal policy of Olivares extracted the financial vitality of the merchant community. The miserable condition of the Castile's merchant community was the last nail in the coffin of the falling economy of the province. Olivares' tenure of power saw the final alienation of Spain's native business community from its king, and the final defeat of native commercial enterprise in the name of royal necessity. The collapsing of the ostentatious credit structure of Seville and the failure of Seville's trading system with the New World between 1639 and 1641 was the price that Olivares had to pay for his highhanded dealing of Spanish merchants. The other provinces of Spain did not have the financial and military capability to compensate the loss incurred due to the fall of Castile. Therefore, it may be convincingly argued that the Spanish decline of the late 16th century and in the 17th century was result of the crisis of the Castile's economy between 1590 and 1620. The erosion of financial and commercial vitality of Castile was the fundamental factor behind the decline of Spain in the 17th century(Elliott 1961, 69-73). It was more a crisis of Castile rather than of Spain.

In 1978, Henry Kamen contributes on the issue of the decline of Spain in early modern era in his paper titled 'The Decline of Spain: A Historical Myth' (*Past & Present*, No. 81 (Nov., 1978), pp. 24-50). Kamen interprets the decline of Spain as a historical myth. He refuses to accept the views postulated by both Earl J. Hamilton and John H. Elliott. While Hamilton argues that there was a clear decline of Spain in the 17th century, Elliott interprets it not as the decline of Spain but the decline of Castile. Kamen raises questions about the validity of the concept of decline as well as the exact chronology or timing of decline in his argument. According to Kamen, the earlier scholars working on the issue have not made it clear what actually decline means. It is not clear whether it was the decline of the Spanish empire or crisis of the Spanish economy or fall of any specific region like Castile. Timing of the crisis is also baffling in this analysis. One reason behind this lack of identifiable and measurable criteria in the argument offered by Hamilton or Elliott is an unjustifiedand superfluous identification of Castile with Spain. Another area of difficulty in this argument is that there is a confusion between Spain and its empire. Kamen highlights that the contemporary Spanish commentators of 16th and 17th centuries recorded the awful condition of the Spanish economy after death even of Ferdinand and Isabella. The modern writers since the time of Hamilton largely view the 16th century as the

golden age of Spain and the 17th century as the period of decline. It creates, according to Kamen, confusion about the timing of decline. The contemporary evidences show that Spain was in the midst of poverty even during so-called flourishing period of the 16th century. For example,Francesco Guicciardini – the Florentine ambassador in 1512 or Hakluyt–an English publicist in 1583 – found immense poverty in Spanish society. The Spanish thinkers in the 16th and 17th centuries identified two basic burdens on country's politics and economy: Spain's excessive foreign commitments and nefarious activities of the foreign traders. Even writers such as Sancho de Moncada (1580-1638) in 1619 opined that discovery of Indies was the root of Spain's poverty. Cellórigo(1559-1633) also supported this view. The *arbitristas* were of opinion that the Spain's empire distorted the development of Spain. All these contemporary evidences – both Spanish and non-Spanish–show that Spain was not a prosperous country though it possessed an empire. The fundamental weakness of the Spanish economy was that though it had an empire, however, it did not possess adequate productive capability and necessary technical skill for industrial development. Consequently, the imperial country had to satisfy itself by exporting raw materials to other European countries and importing finished products from them. It was the basic factor behind the drain of the Spanish economy even during the so-called golden age(Kamen 1978, 24-32).

Henry Kamen has also raised serious doubts about the Elliott's opinion about the time of the decline. According to Elliott, it was the year 1640, which saw the final alienation of the Castilian mercantile community from the state and the failure of the Spanish commercial enterprises. This was the peak of the decline of Spain. Kamen however notes that a number of severe crises, the magnitude of which could not be underestimated, took place in Spain even after 1640. These are revolt in Naples, surrender in the Netherlands, conspiracy in Argon, insurrection in Andalusia, unprecedented spread of plague in the entire peninsula – all these happened after 1640. There were also signs of disintegration of the imperial structure after 1640: Catalonia in 1659, Portugal in 1668, Franche Comté in 1678, St. Domingue in 1697 broke away from Spain. Spain also witnessed series of foreign invasion in the late 17th century and in the 18th century. The Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 was another blow to the Spain's imperial power: Spain lost Flanders and Italy, according to this treaty. Therefore, even in the 18th century, the processof decline was continued in Spain, and

not confined in the year 1640.The historians who believe that there was a decline of Spain in real sense of the term were not however unanimous about the date. Hamilton is of the opinion that though it is difficult to identify the date of decline precisely, it was the 17th century, which saw the crisis in Spain's economy. Elliott on the contrary argues that the expansion of Spain took place between 1492 and 1550; after 1550, there was a gradual decline of the economy of Spain and year of culmination was 1640. According to Kamen, there was no doubt some symptoms of crisis in the economy Castile, royal bankruptcies in 1557 and decline of business at Medina del Campo. However, it is equally true that there was expansion of business activities in late 16th century Spain. The figures collected by Chaunus show that the decline did not begin before the mid-17th century. Spain acquired the Philippines, Milan and Portugal under its control. The country also witnessed general population growth after 1550. In New Castile, some 370 towns emerged. Among these towns, 63 percent had expanding population rate. Therefore, it is difficult to say that there was a general decline of the economy of Spain even after 1550 (Kamen 1978, 32-34).

The main point is that Spain had never been a formidable economic power even in the 16th century. Castile, which could be considered as one of the most advanced regions of Spain, was barely self-sufficient in agriculture during the period under review. Kamen identifies three basic aspects of the economy of Castile from which one can get a clear understanding of the nature of decline: these are population decline, agricultural decay and bullion imports. As far as the population structure is concerned, the epidemics played a vital role in depopulating the country. In 1647-52, the mortality rate in Spain was 9 percent due to the spread of epidemic. From 1676 to 1685, Spain lost its population, especially the urban population, at a much higher rate. The drastic population fall was seen in the city of Ciudad Real (lost half of its population), Badajoz (fall of population by 43 percent between 1640 and 1691), Ayamonte (fall of population by 64 percent between 1640 and 1676). However, there were other symptoms of urban regeneration in the same period. For example, the city of Medina del Campo increased its size by 52 percent between 1646 and 1683. The population of Valencia rose by 50 percent between 1646 and 1692.It is clear form these contradictory figures that demographic ups and down and question of decline could not be easily juxtaposed with each other. Kamen also differs from Elliott on

the question of imbalance created in the economy of Spain due to the government's special favour to the sheep farming. Elliott argues that it worked against the interest of the Spanish agriculture. Kamen however does not find enough statistical evidences in favour of Elliott's argument. He is opinion that there is no proof that the favouring of wool was not necessarily detriment to the agriculture. The equilibrium of the Spanish peasant economy in the 16th and 17th centuries was primarily dependent on the close relationship between agriculture and sheep farming. The Spanish peasant economy could supply the basic subsistence needs, but not at all the marketable surplus. Livestock was, on the contrary, marketable and could be considered as equivalent of readily available capital in the period of needs. Elliott overlooks this critical aspect of the Spanish peasant economy during the period under review. It was the existing economic reality and not the government policy that encouraged the expansion of sheep farming in Spain. Moreover, there is no evidence that official policy of favouring *mesta* (association of sheep ranchers in medieval Castile) acted against the interest of agriculture. The hard times in the sheep farming economy of Spain in the 17th century did not lead to any improvement of agriculture. The Spanish peasant economy remained more or less backward during the entire period. As far as the import of bullion from the New World to Spain is concerned, Hamilton's figures show that between 1503 and 1590 there was a steady rise. After culminating in the peak in 1590, the import of bullion started declining and reached at the lowest level in 1640. It confirms the thesis postulating the idea of the rise and decline of Spain in the 16th century and the 17th century respectively. Hamilton's figures for the slump five-year period 1656-1660 show total imports of under 3.5 million pesos, with a clear hint of even lower totals for subsequent years. The data, according to Kamen, however indicates a different picture. During the period 1671-1700, the five-year totals varied between 35 and 66 million pesos, confirming a departure from earlier amount for the period between 1591 and 1600.There is no conclusive evidence that the second half of the 16th century witnessed decline of bullion imports from America to Spain (Kamen 1978, 35-40).

Kamen argues that the rise and decline of Spain could not be fully explained in terms of agriculture vs. sheep farming, population fall and bullion imports. It needs to be analysed in the broader context ofthe Spanish underdevelopment in the entire early modern era. Early modern Spain failed to develop a unified economic system.

It was a backward country, heavily dependent on external support and supplies. Dependency was the principal character of the Spanish economy in the 16th and 17th centuries. We can take the example of wool trade: it flourished during the period of Ferdinand and Isabella. Mesta was organized to regulate the trade of wool. This period also witnessed the prosperity of Burgos–the commercial capital of Castile. However, the fundamental weakness of the booming wool trade was that Spain exported raw wool (with low-income elasticities) to the other European countries and imported finished textile goods (with high-income elasticities). The unfavourable terms of trade as the exporter of raw materials and importer of finished products contributed to the establishment of foreign merchants' domination in the Spanish economy. In the south of Spain, the Genoese financers exercised control over the economy. The economy of north Castile came to be regulated by the foreign merchants; these merchants even dictated the royal finances. According to Kamen, Spain slowly became a captive of the foreign economic powers. The coming of the bullion to Spain could not solve the problem. As the economic structure of the Peninsula was underdeveloped in nature, it was unable to achieve the balance of trade. The poor production base could not come to any term with the inflow of bullion. The result was that almost the entire amount of the American bullion was transferred to the industrially developed zones of Europe. Therefore, the precious metals did not bring general prosperity in the economy of Spain even in the 16th century. The foreign merchants extended their operation in the New World using Spain as a point of transit. If Spain had an advanced economy with a developed productive capability, the situation would have been definitely different. In that case, it would have extracted raw materials from the New World at cheaper price and exported finished goods to the captive market of colony at a higher price. It was the case of England as a colonial power in the 18th and 19th centuries. France was the one of the greatest beneficiaries of the backward economic condition of Spain. The entire 17th and 18th centuries saw the establishment of unquestionable French domination over Spain. The French control was exercised not only over the metropolitan economy of Castile but also over the regional economy of Aragon, Valencia, Catalonia and Basque provinces. The French were also active in the American trade. In 1670, one-third of all the products sent from Cadiz to America were French. All the available statistical evidences show that French were controlling the economy of

Spain at an unprecedented scale during the period under review. For example, in 1675, the total value of its textile imports from all other parts of Spain was only 5.7 percent of the value of textiles brought in from France. In the same year, wool made up 78 percent of Aragon's export to France and textile made up 51.6 percent of imports. All these data and evidences suggest that the other European nations achieved remarkable industrial progress at the expense of the backwardness of Spain. Spain remained a backward country having an empire. From this analysis, we can conclude that the theory of decline of Spain was historically untenable. The phrase 'dependency' rather than 'decline' is more apt in case of the Spanish case(Kamen 1978, 40-50).

Kamen's view is not however unchallenged and questioned. In 1981, J.I. Israel critically reviews the opinion formulated by Kamen in his paper titled 'The Decline of Spain: A Historical Myth?' (*Past & Present*, No. 91, May., 1981, pp. 170-180). According to Israel, there are several flaws in the Kamen's argument. The first important point raised by Israel is that Kamen identifies the military defeat of Spain as a mark of weakness not before the year 1643 when the Spanish army was defeated by the French at Rocroy. What Kamen forgets to mentionis that the Spanish army was defeated in 1622, by the Dutch at siege of Bergen op Zoom. The Dutch again had a crushing victory against the Spaniards in 1629 (at Hertogenbosch and Wesel) and in 1632 (at Venlo and Maastricht). All these defeats exposed the general weakness of the Spanish military capability in comparison with the other major European powers even before 1643. The second point raised by Israel is the idea of 'dependence'. Israel points out that the term dependence is not free from ambiguity. In order to get a clearer picture, he feels, the relative nature of the term of dependency in the context of history needs to be analysed.While Kamen argues that the entire Spanish economy was backward in nature, Israel shows that until 1590s, the process of urbanization was adequately active in all parts of Castile. In the 16th century, Spain was more urban than France or England. Apart from urbanization, Spain also had bustling industrial centres like Toledo, Segovia, Córdoba, Granada, Soria, Cuenca, Palencia and similar other towns.Two basic factors contributed to the growth of industrial towns in Spain: first, the rising demand due to population increase and secondly, the growth of new demands in Portugal, Indies and north Africa. Until 1590s, the textile industries continued to expand in Spain. Spain also produced high quality wool,

which were sold in Spain and abroad. It is true that the country did not possess linen industry; nevertheless, it had highly specialized silk industry. The industrial towns or areas like Toledo, Granada, Seville, Valencia and Murica were famous for silk industries. There were development of other industries also. For example, the paper industry at Segovia, the lather industry at Córdoba, shipbuilding and iron-founding at Basque country. In the late 16th century, the majority of the ships sailing in the *flotas*(Fleets, Spanish ships, which formerly sailed every year from Cadiz to Vera Cruz, in Mexico, to transport to Spain the production of Spanish America) to the Indies were of Spanish manufacturing. The manufacturing sectors achieved considerable strength in the Castilian public life though the church and the nobility were still more powerful. It contributed to the development of friction of interest between the manufacturing group and the nobility. In 1520, the Castilian towns broke out in revolt against the Spanish crown. The major force behind the revolt were the manufacturers. Though the state suppressed the revolt immediately, the conflict of interest could not be subdued. The textile sector continued to flourish until 1590s in a steady way. The Flemish textile industry faced disturbances in the decade of 1560s and there was no sign of immediate recovery until 1600. The Dutch cloth industry was stimulated from the crisis of the Flemish textile industry, but it did not take place before 1580s. The religious wars in France seriously disrupted the French cloth industry at Amiens, Rouen, and other towns. The crisis of the French textile industry continued until 1590s. The English cloth industry did not produce those fabrics, which had demand in southern Europe.The Spanish textile industry faced serious foreign competition only in the 17th century when Flanders, Holland, France and England started producing textile products, which had demands in the Spanish market. It contributed to the collapse of the textile economy of Castile. The end of war with the United Provinces during this period also opened up the market of Spain before the foreign manufacturers (Israel 1981, 170-176).

The Castilian manufacturers consequently demanded protection from the increasing foreign competition. The Spanish state was finally compelled to impose restriction on the foreign products facing the demands of the indigenous producers. The prolonged economic embargoes were imposed on the Dutch products between 1621 and 1648. Similar prohibitions were imposed on the French products between 1635 and 1659. French ships and cargos were rigorously excluded in Spain and Spanish Indies during

this period. During this period, there some sorts of economic regeneration in Spain. However, it did not last long. In the second half of the 17th century, Spain was bound to open its market for the foreign products. It was the final blow to the Spanish manufacturing sectors. Spain became virtually the captive market of the Dutch, French and English companies. Israel did not also find any rationality in the Kamen's argument of decline of agriculture and fall of population. Israel argues that until the end of the 16th century, there was steady growth of urbanization and agricultural expansion in Castile. The large-scale migration of rural population towards the urban areas did not take place before 1611. Therefore, the assumption of Kamen regarding the fall of population due to the epidemic (1599-1602) and the expulsion of Moriscos (1609) was misleading. Israel is of opinion that it is difficult to deny the decline of Spain in the 17th century, and thedeclineof Spain was not a myth.(Israel 1981, pp, 177-180).

The historical debate on the question of decline of Spain does not however come to an end with the publication of Jonathan Israel's paper in the *Past and Present*. Henry Kamen publishes a Rejoinder on the issue in the same issue of Past and Present. Kamen also elaborates his argument in his book titled *Golden Age Spain* (1988, 2005). Kamen points out that he does not oppose Israel's view on the expansion of certain industrial sectors of Castile economy was expanded: it includes textile and shipping. However, this expansion of the Castilian industrial economy did not lead to the 'take off' of Spain towards the full capitalist transition or transformation. Israel tries to show that the Spanish industrial expansion was continued until 1590. Nevertheless, from 1576, the Spanish industrial export to Italy substantially declined. The Spanish export declined two-thirds of the value of goods imported from Italy. It actually reflected the domestic crisis of the Spanish economy. The textile industry was able to survive only in Segovia until 1590s,the population fall took place in Spain much before second decade of the 17th century. Moreover, the Spanish industrial development was cosmetic rather than organic. There was fundamental structural weakness in the economy of early modern Spain, from which it could never recover. It was an intellectually backward region in Europe. There was no significant achievement in Spain during this period and the Spaniards preferred to remain insular in relation to the rest of Europe. All these indicate that Spain was in the stage of stagnation and dependency in the early modern era. Therefore, the question of decline does not arise here (Kamen 1981, pp. 181-185; Kamen 2005, 40-56).

Carlos Álvarez-Nogal and Leandro Prados De La Escosura add new dimensionsto the debate on the question of decline of Spain from completely new perspectives. In two research papers–'The decline of Spain (1500-1850): conjectural estimates' and 'The rise and fall of Spain (1270-1850)'–they try to understand the economy of Spain and especially its decline in the perspectives of trends of urbanization and agricultural and aggregate output in the national level and regional level. Their researches find that per capita income in Spain grew in 16th and early 19th centuries, while shrinkage and sluggishness took place in the 17th and 18th centuries.At the time of its imperial expansion, Spain was a relatively advanced country in terms of per capita income during its imperial expansion, and by 1590, it was only behind the Low Countries and Italy as far as the per capita income was concerned. Spain's decline had its roots in the 17th century and economic backwardness deepened in the first half of the 19th century. In fact, the longer view of the economy of Spain highlights the fact that unlike other European countries, Spain had achieved its highest living standards in the 1340s, not by mid-15th century. To be more precise, during the 14th and 15th centuries, Spain displayed a different trajectory of development from that of the western Europe. Most of Spain had a frontier economy with a shortage of labour and abundance of land. It directly implies highest land-labour ratios and possibly increasing returns to labour. According to Álvarez-Nogal and Escosura, it explains the sustained growth of the Spanish economy in the 14th century. Spain was able to expand its economy until 16th century. During the 17th and 18th centuries, according to these two scholars, there was decline of economy of Spain as it is revealed from the analysis of per capita income. It finally made Spain an economically backward country in the 19th century (Álvarez-Nogal and Escosura 2007, pp. 319-366; Álvarez-Nogal and Escosura 2013, pp. 1-37).

2.3 Conclusion

At the present stage of researches, it is not a very easy task to draw a general conclusion on the question of decline of Spain. A common agreement seems to be implausible now. The scholars who are in favour of the theory of decline of Spain tend to collect their data either from supply of precious metals from the New World to Spain or from per capita income. The arguments of Jonathan Israel do not depend

much on statistical evidences. On the contrary, the scholars who argues that there was no suchdecline of Spain as it was backward country altogether despite some expansion of trade and industry relatively prefer to depend on macro-level data. One point is clear that Spain did not have any unified economic structure in its pre modern phase of history. The micro-level economic data is non-existent in this regard. Therefore, it is very difficult to discern a comprehensive conclusion on the basis of limited amount of data. It is also unclear what kind of disparity existed in income distribution during the period under review in early modern Spain. One point is relevant to understand the extent and degree of the problem: the scholars have talked about the migration of workforce (both within Spain and from Spain to abroad). There is no doubt that it was largely forced migration due to lack of scope of work in rural areas of Spain. It definitely indicates that Spain was a backward country during the period under review. Another important point is that the bullion imported from America was not invested in any productive sectors within Spain. There were three possible channels through which, the bullion was circulated: firstly, the import of industrial goods from other European countries for the American market; secondly, investment for pursuing an aggressive foreign policy in Europe and elsewhere; thirdly, consumption of the precious commodities of the Spanish elites. It indicates that there was no scope for productive investment within the Spanish economy in its early modern phase of history. The absence of sufficient productive sectors is a proof of the backwardness of the Spanish economy. Nevertheless, more researches are required in this regard to have a clear picture what happened in Spain's economy in the 16th and 17th centuries.

2.4 Model Questions

1. Discuss the decline of Spain in the historical perspectives of early modern Spain.
2. What are the historical arguments on the question of decline of Spain?
3. Do you think that Spain experienced a real decline in the 16th and 17th centuries?
4. Analyse the debates on the decline of Spain in early modern era.

2.5 Suggested Readings

Álvarez-Nogal, Carlos and Leandro Prados De La Escosura. 'The decline of Spain (1500-1850): conjectural estimates'. *European Review of Economic History*, Vol 11, No. 3, (December 2007). pp. 319–366.

Álvarez-Nogal, Carlos and Leandro Prados De La Escosura. 'The rise and fall of Spain (1270-1850)'. *The Economic History Review,* 66, 1 (2013), pp. 1-37.

Casey, James. *Early Modern Spain. A Social History*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Cipolla, Carlo M. *Before the Industrial Revolution: European Society and Economy, 1000 – 1700*. USA: W.W. Norton & Company, 1976.

Cipolla, Carlo M. (Ed.). 1979. *The Fontana Economic History of Europe: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Great Britain: Collins/Fontana Books, 1979.

Cooper, J. P (Ed.). *The New Cambridge Modern History. The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years War, 1609-48/49.* Cambridge: CUP, 1970.

Elliott, John H. 'The Decline of Spain'. *Past & Present*, No. 20 (Nov., 1961), pp. 52-75

Elliott, John H. *Imperial Spain*. England: Penguin Books, 1963.

Israel, J.I. 'The Decline of Spain: A Historical Myth'.*Past & Present*, No. 91 (May., 1981), pp. 170-180.

Kamen, Henry. 'The Decline of Spain: A Historical Myth'.*Past & Present*, No. 81 (Nov., 1978), pp. 24-50.

Kamen, Henry. 'The Decline of Spain: A Historical Myth?: A Rejoinder.' *Past & Present*, 91 (May., 1981), pp. 181-185.

Kamen, Henry. *Golden Age Spain*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Rich, R.R and C.H. Wilson. *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, Vol IV. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Vittorio, Antonio Di (Ed.). *An Economic History of Europe: From Expansion to Development*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. *Cambridge History of Europe: Early Modern Europe, 1450-1789*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Zanden, Jan Luiten van. *The Long Road to the Industrial Revolution: The European Economy in a Global Perspective, 1000-1800*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Unit 3 ❑ Decline of Italy

Structure

3.0 Objectives

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Recent arguments on the question of decline of Italy

3.3 Conclusion

3.4 Model Questions

3.5 Suggested Readings

3.0 Objectives

- The objective of the present unit is to understand the decline of Italy in the 17th century.
- The recent historiographical arguments on the decline of Italy will also be analyzed.
- The learners will be given an idea about the various aspects of the decline of Italy.

3.1 Introduction

We would like to begin the discussion of the present unit by saying that a lot has already been discussed related to the decline of Italy in the Unit 1 of the present Module. The decline of the Mediterranean economy could not be meaningfully discussed without analysing the economic condition of Italy. Therefore, you may find some areas of discussion and analysis are overlapping. Nevertheless, the present unit aims to discuss the decline of Italy in the 17th century, especially in terms of its economy.

3.2 Recent arguments on the question of decline of Italy

As we have already presented the data related to the decline of Italy in the Unit 1, let us now begin the analysis with one of the incidences that aggravated the crisis in the Italian economy. Italy became the ground of warfare, foreign control and financial exactions between 1494 and 1538. The powerful international states like Spain and France became involved in the Italian matter. Two principal factors attracted the European powers to Italy: (i) political fragmentation of Italy into relatively weak principalities in the later Middle Ages and (ii) Italy's advanced cultural and economic development (Cipolla 1976, 236; Bonney 1991, 79). In his research, Cipolla argues that the foreign involvement in Italy in the late 15th century and early 16th century was followed by famines, epidemics, destruction of capital and disruption of trade. We have already analysed the fall of industrial production in different Italian cities in Unit 1. All these analyses have been made by Cipolla in 1976. In recent historiographical development, some major revisions about the Italian history are made suggesting a break from the older understanding. It is, nevertheless, difficult to deny that the different Italian cities lost the leadership in the European economy. But,it does not seem to imply a complete breakdown or collapse of the economy of Italy.

The study of Judith C. Brown also points out that the notion of decline of Italy in the early modern era might be rightly questioned. Brown discusses in detail the theory of re-feudalization of the Italian economy in the 16th and 17th centuries. For example, Ruggiero Romano argues that the so-called Renaissance did not bring any structural change in the Italian economy. A new feudalism–that is, the bourgeois feudalism – emerged in Italy in the 17th century. In other words, Italy became a 'refeudalized society'. In the context of the deepening economic crisis, the Italian elites reinvested their surplus amount to the rural economy, purchased feudal property, government offices and rights. They also invested in the government bonds to secure their income. The establishment of dominance of the elites in the rural society also indicates the increasing exploitation imposed on the peasantry. This development of parasitic social classes blocked the possibility of any real progress of the socio-economic structure in early modern Italy. It only intensified peasant

exploitation. Philip Jones also supported the same view that Italy retrogressed towards feudal capitalism. Carlo Cipolla sees refeudalization not as the cause but as the consequence of the 17th century crisis. The Italian manufacturers, according to Cipolla, failed to compete with the French or the British producers as the French or British commodities were cheaper than the Italian products. Cipolla further argues that the guild regulations, high taxes and high wages played negative role in the industrial development of Italy in the 17th century. Facing the economic crisis, the Italian elites transferred their capital to the rural sector,-the process which was termed as refeudalization. It converted Italy from a 'fully matured economy' to 'an underdeveloped country'. This view is opposed by Domenico Sella. From Sella's research it is clear that the agriculture in Lombardy had good progress in the mid-17th century. He argues that the vigorous rural sector does not support the view, which views Italy had a stagnant refeudalized society during the period under review. The agriculture of Tuscany experienced notable transformations: these transformations were geared by demographic changes and land reclamation. It was started in the 16th century and continued in the next century. The labour shortage caused by the plague increased the value of labour-power. It actually enhanced the wage in real term. The peasants of Lombardy were also the beneficiaries of the changing situation between 1600 and 1700. Some peasant families also appropriated the opportunity created by the shift of urban industries to rural areas. For example, they supplemented their income from the newly developed silk industry.Rural industries such as silk making, mining, and paper manufacturing, represented areas of net growth in the Italian economy of the late Renaissance. The case of wool was however different. Nevertheless, the decline of urban woollen industry was compensated by the development of rural woollen industry especially in Veneto. The recent researches point out that the Italian industry survived in the 17th century–sometimes reduced and altered-but largely remained significant. This rural industrialization provided positive impetus to the urban economics also. Precisely speaking, the rural areas acted as the economic hinterland of the urban centres like Venice. The city became a regional port servicing its growing hinterland and its domestic market. In 1680, for example, the city imported over two million pounds of raw wool, in addition to large quantities of dyes and alum. The final destination of these products was not Venice but the Venetian mainland. Venice assumed a new role in the changing economic scenario:

it was the entrepôt for retailing and processing agricultural products. It certainly compensated the financial loss occurred due to shifting international balance of trade in the 17th century. The city of Florence developed the silk industry as well as production of luxury goods. All these evidences amply show that the Italian rural society and economy adjusted and readjusted in the 16th and 17th centuries, indicating not a total collapse, but relative prosperity accomplished through rural industrialization(Brown 1989, 761-780).

Christopher F. Black in his research shows that there were evidences of industrial activity in different cities of Europe. Black is of opinion that there is no absolute decline in the 17th century Italy: rather, it was shifts and gains within the economic structure of Italy during the period under review. It is indeed difficult to find out the traces of profound economic and cultural decline of Italy during this period. Even the available data does not confirm to the idea of any fall of standard of living in Italy. The Italian economy slowly recovered from the effect of the Black Death despite the fact that it created acute labour shortage in the rural areas. In the 15th and 16th centuries, the symbols of economic regeneration were evident in the economic processes of Italy. The urban capital came to be invested in the rural properties. It cost to the dispossession of the small landholders in many cases. In the 15th and 16th centuries, the vitality or the inner strength of the Italian economy was primarily urban in nature. Michel de Montaigne, who toured Italy in 1580-81, saw wealthy cities and gloomy countryside. Even he found lawlessness and robbery in rural Italy. It indicates the existence of rural poverty in the 15th and 16th centuries Italy. In 18th century, the situation was a different one. The buoyant urban centres were less visible; the urban Italy hardly possessed industrial activities. Black argues that there was a shift of the gravity of economic activities from urban Italy to rural Italy in the 17th centuries. This new economic pattern was based on agricultural development and proliferation of associated rural industries in the countryside. Black is of opinion that this shift was a result of the crisis of the 17th century (Black 2001, 32-33).

It is already noted that the European powers were heavily involved in Italy in 16th century. A multiple factors acted against the Italian industries during this period: these were the Italian wars, threats from the Turks in Mediterranean, the expansion of European contacts around the world, the discovery of new sources of silver, gold,

spices and luxury silks–all had adverse effects on the manufacturing sectors of Italy and overseas trade in the 16th century. However, there were some areas, which compensated the fall of production in the 16th century. For example, while wool manufacturing declined in Venice and Florence, silks, glassware, pottery, furniture, musical instruments and book production developed their production. There was expansion of production of luxury goods in Italy for the elites of the society. Textile, jewellery, glass and furniture became elaborate, fashion consciousness and sophisticated. The cosmetic and soap industries were developed in the Italian city like Venice in the 16th century. The Genoese capitalists invested money in the Spanish empire: it fuelled urban manufacturing and investment in land. Historians like Richard Goldthwaite argue that this prosperity was not meant for all: there was emerging income disparity and social inequality in the Italian economic structure. The losers were small wool producers, artisans, patricians and a section of the peasantry, especially the poor peasantry. The rich urban families, the ecclesiastical institutes and hospitals invested capital in rural lands. This investment in rural lands brought mixed impact in the rural social structure. The investment in land with irrigation facilities, the plantation of mulberry and fruit trees and expansion of dairy farming could provide additional income to the rural folks. However, it is also true that there was a transition from labour intensive arable to pasture in the Italian countryside. It brought certain new features in the rural economy: one fundamental aspect is that a section of the peasantry was forced to leave their lands due to the development of a new type of pasture based economy and urban investment in rural areas. There was a profound change in the fiscal policy, which transferred the tax burden from the urban elites to the rural taxpayers. It resulted in the development of rural indebtedness and liquidation of small peasant proprietors in most cases. This process of social differentiation also expanded the number of sharecroppers. The general trend of the 16th century is that a large section of the people lost their possession and entitlements in the existing social fabric of the rural Italy. Expropriation and exploitation of the peasantry were the most dominant features of the Italian society in the 16th century. This deterioration of the rural economy in 16th century Italy contributed to the spread of violence, brigandage and banditry in many parts of the country (Black 2001, 33-34).

There is a general agreement that Italy faced economic crisis in 17th century, especially since 1590, due to the shift of the gravity of the commercial activities of Europe from the Mediterranean region to the Atlantic region. The 17th century saw the rise of the Netherlands, France and England in the international trade. In the decade of 1590s, the English and the Dutch traders entered Mediterranean to carry the Baltic grains. The English traders gradually expanded their commercial activities in the Italian port like Livorno. They joined the Turks, Berbers, Uskoksand others in depredating Italian, especially Venetian, shipping. Consequently, Italy declined as an exporter of commodities like woollen textile and metallurgy. The cheaper textiles of the English and Dutch origin captured the market driving out the relatively costlier Italian cloths. The situation became worse for the Italian manufacturers as the European political scenario underwent changes producing negative results. The German war of 1618, the subsequent disruption of overland trade to and through the German states and the increased taxation imposed on the Italian possessions by the Spanish government to meet the war expenditure – all these developments in the first half of the 17th century affected the health of the Italian economy. Moreover, north Italy faced typhus and plague in 1620s and 1630s, which caused a fall of population. The increasing mortality rate in the cities like Milan and Venice disrupted the industrial production substantially. Nevertheless, since the mid-17th century, the Italian economy started recovering. The lesser towns and countryside showed relatively greater prosperity. The armament makers were able to accrue profit because of war. The sea route was gradually replaced by the land route, which was not very costly. The plague reduced the labour supply; however, it, on the contrary, increased the value of labour. It could bring additional income to the labouring poor in the second half of 17th century Italy. The major industrial activities were also shifted towards the rural regions of Italy from the urban areas. It indicates the creation of opportunity of income for the rural families. There was also increased participation of the female labour force in the newly developed rural industries for supplementing the family income. This rural decentralization of production process, which could also be termed as protoindustrialization, augmented the general income pattern of rural Italy from the second half of the 16th century. The silk industry, for example, was one of the beneficiaries of rural migration of industrial activities. In many cases, the small landholders became weavers to earn some extra income (Black 2001, 34-

36). According to Black, the second half of the 16th century and the entire 17th century more or less witnessed the proliferation of the industries in rural Italy. This trend continued until the 18th century.

A recent study by Paolo Malanima in his paper titled "When did England overtake Italy? Medieval and early modern divergence in prices and wage" (*European Review of Economic History*, 17, 45–70) shows that the conventional notion on the divergence and wages in the early modern era does not reflect the reality. The conventional notion is that between 1500 and 1750, a great divergence occurred among countries in the level of wages. Italian real wages belonged to the lowest level in comparison with that of the other European nations. Their relative level even diminished from the 17th century onwards. Robert C. Allen argues that the range of the European real wages widened during the period 1500-1750, and Italy and England represented the higher and lower margins of this "great divergence". According to Paolo Malanima, it is not a correct interpretation of the available data on price and wage. Malanima's research shows that a divergence of about 50 per cent already existed in the late Middle Ages and was in favour of Italy. A convergence (and not at all divergence) occurred in the 16th and 17th centuries. England only overtook Italy in 1670-1730, that is, during the late 17th century. The disparity widened year by year and was particularly significant during the last decades of the 19th century, when masons' wages in Italy were one-third of those in England (Malanima 2013, 45-70).Therefore, this view does not support the conventional argument that Italy experienced a decline in the 17th century. On the contrary, it supports the researches of Christopher F. Black that there was no such absolute decline of the Italian economy in the 16th and 17th centuries; there were in fact diversifications and proliferations of industrial activities in rural Italy. This rural industrialization possibly regenerated the economy largely. The long-term analysis of the GDP of Italy between 1300 and 1913 shows that the country was rich in the period of the Renaissance; nevertheless, it experienced fall of economy in the 16th century. The economy was again regenerated in the 17th century. This argument is entirely based on the rise and fall of the gross domestic product (GDP) of central and northern Italy between 1300 and 1913. (Malanima 2011, 169-219). The analysis of GDP does not also support the view that there was a decline of the Italian economy in the 17th century.

3.3 Conclusion

The development of new researches raises many questions and serious doubts regarding the validity of the notion of decline of Italy in the 17th century. The older arguments highlights the many aspects of decline especially in the 17th century due to the shift of international economic balance from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic and the rise of the Netherlands, England and France. This argument emphasizes only on the emerging international trading structure. The new researches focus primarily on the question of internal shifts, adjustments and reinvestment. The development of rural industry is the key in interpreting the economic revitalization of Italy in the 17th century. The present state of knowledge can confirm only that more researches are required for precise and quantitative understanding of these shifts and readjustment in the internal economy of Italy in the 16th and 17th centuries.

3.4 Model Questions

1. How do you explain the decline of Italy in the 17th century?
2. What is the historiographical critique of the decline of Italy in the 17th century?
3. What are the revisionist arguments of the decline of Italy during the 17th century?

(The learners are requested to study Unit 1 and Unit 3 collectively as the theme is overlapping.)

3.5 Suggested Readings

Acemoglu, Daron, Simon Johnson and James Robinson. “The Rise of Europe: Atlantic Trade, Institutional Change, and Economic Growth”. *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 95, No. 3 (Jun., 2005), pp. 546-579.

Black, Christopher F. *Early Modern Italy. A Social History*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Bonney, Richard. *The European Dynastic States, 1494-1660. The Short Oxford History of Modern World.* Oxford: OUP, 1991.

Brown, Judith C. "Prosperity or Hard Times in Renaissance Italy?". *Renaissance Quarterly,* Vol. 42, No. 4 (Winter, 1989), pp. 761-780.

Cameron, Euan (Ed). *Early Modern Europe: An Oxford History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Cipolla, Carlo M. *Before the Industrial Revolution: European Society and Economy, 1000-1700*. USA: W.W. Norton & Company, 1976.

Cipolla, Carlo M. (Ed.). 1979. *The Fontana Economic History of Europe: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Great Britain: Collins/Fontana Books, 1979.

Duplessis, Robert S. *Transitions to Capitalism in Early Modern Europe*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Koenigsberger, H.G: *Early Modern Europe, 1500-1789*. England: Pearson Education Limited, 1987.

Malanima, Paolo. "The long decline of a leading economy: GDP in central and northern Italy, 1300-1913". *European Review of Economic History*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (August 2011), pp. 169-219.

Malanima, Paolo. "When did England overtake Italy? Medieval and early modern divergence in prices and wage". *European Review of Economic History*, Vol 17, No. 1, (February 2013), pp. 45-70.

Munck, Thomas.*History of Europe. Seventeenth Century Europe 1598-1700. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598-1700.* USA: Macmillan Education, 1990.

Musgrave, Peter. *The Early Modern European Economy*. London: Macmillan, 1999.

Miller, John. *Early Modern Europe, 1450-1750*. UK: CUP, 2017.

Prak, Maarten (Ed.). *Early Modern Capitalism: Economic and social change in Europe, 1400-1800*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Rich, R.R and C.H. Wilson. *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, Vol IV. London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Vittorio, Antonio Di (Ed.). *An Economic History of Europe: From Expansion to Development*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. *Cambridge History of Europe: Early Modern Europe, 1450-1789*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Zanden, Jan Luiten van. *The Long Road to the Industrial Revolution: The European Economy in a Global Perspective, 1000-1800*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Unit 4 ❑ Nature and the Extent of the Crisis: Economic, Social and Political Dimensions

Structure

4.0 Objectives

4.1 Introduction

4.2 The Historical arguments on the 17th century Crisis

4.2.1 The Eurocentric School

4.3 The 17th Century Crisis in Europe: Economic, Social and Political Dimensions

4.3.1 The 17th Century Crisis: The Economic and Social Dimensions

4.3.1.1 Population

4.3.1.2 Agriculture

4.3.1.3 Industry

4.3.1.4 The Economic Crisis

4.3.2 The 17th Century Crisis: The Political Dimensions

4.4 Conclusion

4.5 Model Questions

4.6 Suggested Readings

4.0 Objectives

- To understand the origin, nature and extent of the 17th century crisis in Europe.
- To comprehend the historiographical critique of the crisis.
- To appreciate the socio-economic dimensions of the crisis.
- To know the political dimensions of the crisis.

4.1 Introduction

The so-called 17th century crisis is one of the most debatable themes in the history of early modern Europe. A number of historians have participated in the debate since the decade of 1950s and with the progress of the debate, new issues emerged, unconventional data was explored and the scope of the debate was expanded. It touches the issues not only of the 17th century political structure but also economic and social processes. Moreover, it is also argued that it left impact on the 18th century socio-economic and political development. The global nature of the crisis is also highlighted in some researches. This new genre of research has expanded the frontier of the 17th century crisis beyond the geographical boundary of Europe: new territories with new issues are incorporated in these researches. Therefore, the 17th century crisis is a complex historical phenomenon leaving deep impact on the history of Europe as well as on the other parts of globe. In this unit, we will discuss the nature and extent of the crisis in the perspectives of economy, society and politics of the contemporary era. We will also focus on the historiographical aspects of the crisis.

4.2 The Historical arguments on the 17th century Crisis

Though the professional historians have been engaged in arguing on the nature and extent of the 17th century crisis since the decade of 1950s, nevertheless, the contemporary observers also made important statements on it. A sense of crisis, an apprehension of turmoil and a general fear of breakdown were expressed in the 17th and 18th centuries: John Goodwin (a pamphleteer) in 1642, Jeremiah Whittaker (a preacher) in 17th century, and Ralph Josselin (the vicar of the village of Earls Colne in Essex) in 1652 had expressed concern about the growing turmoil and crisis. Same descriptions about social upheavals and disorders could be found in the writings of Robert Mentet de Salmonet (a Scottish exile in France), Wenceslaus Hollar (a Bohemian graphic artist), Giovanni Battista Birago Avogadro (a historian and juris consult who lived in the first half of the 17th century), Lieuwe van Aitzema (a Dutch historian of 17th century), Thomas Hobbes (famous British political theorist) and

Voltaire (French philosopher) were among those who felt the growing crisis of the polity, economy and culture. The destabilization of the social structure, the crumbling of the economic processes and erosion of the dominant political configuration were not gone unnoticed by these contemporary observers. An analysis of these observations shows that the majority of the contemporaries viewed it as a European crisis. Voltaire was the exception, who discovered it even beyond the boundary of Europe. Nevertheless, the modern historical arguments begin in the decade of 1950s with the publication of Eric J. Hobsbawm's essays titled "The General Crisis of the European Economy in the 17th Century" and "The Crisis of the 17th Century—II" in the famous journal *Past and Present* in May 1954 and November 1954 respectively. These two essays initiated an extensive debate on the very issues of the 17th century crisis. The publication of the Hobsbawm's papers has been followed by the series of publications of H. R. Trevor-Roper, J. H. Elliott, Roland Mousnier, J. H. Elliott, Lawrence Stone, E. H. Kossmann, J. H. Hexter, Geoffrey Parker etc. The French scholars like Jean JurPs and Lucien Febvre also participate in the debate. There are three major historiographical critiques in the understanding of the 17th century crisis. The first school is the Eurocentric School; the second is the Annales School; and the third is the global approach. Now we will try to analyse each school in some detail(Parker and Smith 2005, 1-6; Dewald 2008, 1031-1032).

4.2.1 The Eurocentric School

Those scholars, who believe that it was essentially a European crisis, have first initiated the debate on the question of the 17th century crisis. This school includes both the Marxist and the non-Marxist scholars. Hobsbawm–the famous British historian, initiates the first scholarly discussion in 1954. In two lengthy articles published in the renowned journal *Past and Present*, he tries to understand the causes, nature and results of the crisis. (Hobsbawm May, 1954 and Nov., 1954). The societal disruption and its consequences–both have come under the purview of discussion initiated by Hobsbawm. It in fact expands the frontiers of argument incorporating the social and the economic aspects of the crisis within the discussion. Hobsbawm tries to understand the chaotic situation as a single transformative social crisis of 17th century Europe. In his analysis, he first makes a distinction between the earlier crisis (for example the 14th century crisis) and the 17th century crisis.

According to him, as far as the consequences are concerned, the 17th century crisis was different from its predecessors: it removed the obstacles before the coming of the bourgeois capitalist socio-economic structure in 18th century. The 17th century experienced a general decline unlike the 14th century crisis. It was not simply an economic regression or fall of certain regions or decline of the older trade routes: the 17th century crisis in Europe was much more than any local or regional crisis. Hobsbawm identifies certain profound changes in the economy of Europe during this period bearing indications of the general nature of the crisis. A major area of Europe faced serious economic problem: this area included Mediterranean, Germany, the Baltic Poland and Denmark. Hapsburg Austria was apparently a powerful empire; nevertheless, its economy was poor and lacked a stable structure. The exceptions, according to Hobsbawm, were England, Sweden, the United Provinces, Russia and Switzerland. France was in an intermediate stage. As far as the population growth is concerned, the entire Europe except areas like the Netherlands, Norway, and perhaps Sweden and Switzerland witnessed decline of population. These included Spain, Italy, Poland, Germany, eastern France and Hungary. The English population growth became slower and, after 1630, it ceased. The industrial advancement was halted. Italy became an exporter of cheap raw materials from an industrially advanced nation. The most advanced areas of Europe–industrially and culturally–became one of the backward regions in 17th century. Only England, Sweden and Switzerland were able to retain their production level. The trading zone of Mediterranean and the Baltic underwent transformation. The Baltic-the European colony of the western urbanized countries-changed its staple exports from foodstuffs to products like timber, metals and naval stores, while its traditional imports of western woollens diminished. The Baltic trade reached its peak between 1590 and 1620. It declined in the decade of 1620s, and catastrophically collapsed in the subsequent decades until 1650s. There was no major improvement of trade up to 1700. The trading pattern of Mediterranean evolved like the Baltic. After 1650s, it became the supplier of raw materials to the Atlantic manufacturers. The north western industrial manufacturers were able to achieve monopoly over the commodity production. The French and Dutch trading pattern was also interesting. The French trade with the Levant halved between 1620 and 1635. However, it sank almost to zero by 1650s. There was no recovery of French trade until 1670s. The Dutch trade with the Levant did not perform well

between 1617 and 1650. There was decline of international trade of foodstuff–Baltic corn, Dutch herrings and Newfoundland fish–during the same period under review. The export figures of Europe did not rise significantly between 1620 and 1660 (Hobsbawm 1954, 33-36). The most significant aspect of the 17th century was that it saw the occurrence of innumerable social revolts in many parts of Europe. It is one of the reflections of the general nature of the crisis. These were the revolt of Fronde in France, Catalan, Neapolitan and Portuguese rebellions in the Spanish Empire in the 1640s, the Swiss peasant war in 1653 and the English Revolution. In Eastern Europe, peasants broke out in revolt against their enserfment. In 1680, the Bohemian peasants revolted against the growing feudal exploitation (Hobsbawm 1954, 37).

Hobsbawm after analysing the extent of the crisis of the 17th century pays attention towards the causes of the crisis. According to him, the capitalist development would require the fulfilment of two basic conditions: the creation of capital and the growth of free labour force. Only simultaneous creation of these two conditions in a given space and time could ensure the emergence of capitalism. In fact, it is the basic Marxist view of the question of transition from feudalism to capitalism. Italy even in the 16th century possibly still possessed largest amount of capital. However, the presence of this capital did not automatically lead to the growth of capitalist social structure in Italy. This enormous amount of capital was invested largely in unproductive sectors like buildings, art forms etc. Hobsbawm is opinion that there was hardly any room of productive investment in this feudal setting. Capital evolved under this system as a parasite. This socio-economic contradiction of the early modern Italian society could not be resolved without liquidating the existing social fabric and dominant property relationship. Hobsbawm also takes care of the fact that the different regions of Europe had different types of contradictions. For example, the re-enserfment of the peasantry in Eastern Europe re-feudalized the society and ensured the establishment of second serfdom. It definitely increased the power of the lords in the eastern society. However, it also created crisis and contradiction within this society. The emergence of second serfdom in the agrarian society of Eastern Europe actually turned the free peasantry into serfs. It implied the diminishing purchase power of the peasants and subsequently contraction of market. Hobsbawm also shows that the upper nobility consolidated its position at the cost of the lesser nobility during the period of the re-feudalization of the rural social structure. Their

socio-economic preponderance was diminishing. For example, the lesser nobility controlled 43.8 percent of ploughs in the mid-15th century; in the mid-17th century, it came down to 11.6 percent. The share of the upper nobility regarding the ownership of plough increased from 13.3 to 30.7 in the same period. The re-emergence of feudalism in Eastern Europe also crippled its market largely. These changes opened up new avenues of income and making of profit to the feudal lords. Now the East European feudal lords supplied food grains not only to the Western Europe but also to the Mediterranean region. It intensified exploitation in the agrarian society, leading to the frequent occurrence of peasant revolts and demographic catastrophe. As far as the colonial trade is concerned, the European manufacturers did not accrue profit from it. The different mercantile companies tried only to secure their monopoly over trade routes and commodities. The initial conquest of the new geographical territories brought profit in Europe. Nevertheless, it did not last long. The cost of maintaining overseas empire was rising. Trade was not necessarily linked with production process: the only aim of the monopoly traders was to supply the commodity to the European market at the highest possible price. Until the Industrial Revolution, the European manufacturers did not have connection with the overseas market. The profit of overseas trade was monopolized by the various mercantile companies. It created deep contradiction within the European society. It was indeed a contradiction of the pre-industrial colonial empire based on pure monopoly rights. It was difficult for the European free traders to accept the monopoly rights of the chartered companies. It was one very serious aspect of the 17th century crisis in Europe. The internal social structure or home market was also not free from contradiction. The 16th century saw the growing investment in lands in the rural areas of Western Europe: it significantly increased the power of the rural magnets. The rise of rich peasantry or kulak-type property owners destroyed the peasant independence. Even it would be erroneous if we assume that the urban investment in land liberated the peasantry from land. On the contrary, it actually reinforced the peasant exploitations in the rural areas of Western Europe. In the east, the feudal relationships in the agrarian structure reinforced through the rise of second serfdom. The urban investment in the agrarian economy in 17th century Europe did not automatically create capitalism. Rather, Hobsbawm argues that a parasitic bourgeoisie was created in the rural agrarian structure, especially in France. The imposition of this enormous burden on

peasantry – the pressure of the state, landlords and urban invertors–hampered the productivity of the European agriculture in the 17th century. It caused the rapid rise of agricultural products, and consequently affected the manufacturing sector. A general price hike compelled the masses to reduce the standard of living during the period under review. The persistent decline of the real wage in 17th century Europe actually stopped the demand for some industrial products(Hobsbawm 1954, 37-48).

Hobsbawm argues that the 16th century economic expansion took place in such a socio-economic framework, that was not capable to hold it for a long period. Once the economic growth reached the frontier of the feudal social fabric, it started crumbling and eventually collapsed. Therefore, the crisis of the 17th century was a crisis of the feudal mode of production. It reached its possible limits with the expansion of the economic frontier in the 16th century. Now it required a complete breakdown to reach the next stage of historical development, that is, capitalism. This crisis was indeed an indication ofEurope's transformation towards the capitalist mode of production and dissolution of the feudal social relations completely.

The class based Marxist interpretation of the 17th century crisis, as postulated by Hobsbawm, initiated prolonged debates among the historians. The first criticism came from H. R. Trevor-Roper in 1959. He published a lengthy article in the 'Past and Present' (Past &Present, No. 16 (Nov., 1959), pp. 31-64). In this article, Trevor-Roper raised several questions regarding the argument of Hobsbawm and offered an alternative interpretation of the 17th century crisis. Trevor-Roper first tried to understand the extent and degree of the 17th century crisis. He pointed out that the revolutionary changes of the 17th century were not confined to any particular region of Europe: the revolutionary changes were seen in almost all regions of Europe. Therefore, the simple question that struck the contemporary observer as well as the modern historians was the causes of these revolutionary changes and crisis. One general explanation was continuous warfare in Europe during this period, which weakened the very foundation of state and society. For example, the Thirty Years' War dislocated the established structure of trade and trading networks. It created unemployment on the one hand and ruined the commercial as well as manufacturing centres to a large extent. Apart from war, there was widespread peasant unrest in Europe during the same period. All these wars and mutinies contributed to the birth

of revolutionary crisis. This argument was, however, not acceptable to Trevor-Roper for two fundamental reasons. Firstly, 16th century Europe saw such wars, which did not lead to any revolutionary changes. Secondly, the 17th century revolutionary changes were most explicitly evident in England, which was free from war during the same period. Therefore, the frequent occurrence of war or its intensity could not provide any easy explanation of the origin of 17th century crisis. The very structure of European state and administration remained unchanged in spite of the changes in the religious world in the 16th century. On the contrary, the 17th century saw the disruptions in the structure of state and administration: the crisis in European polity gave birth to a new type of state and society in 17th century. It was a revolutionary change that Europe experienced during this period. The continuity in the realm of politics, state and administration which had prevailed in Europe since the 15th century now ceased in the 17th century. Trevor-Roper argued that such a massive change could only be explained not by war but by the structural weakness of the European monarchical state system.

To Trevor-Roper, the Marxist interpretation is also not tenable as it tried to view or interpret the revolutionary changes and crisis of 17th century as a manifestation of the crisis of relations and forces of production: a crisis of feudalism which was quickly eroded and capitalism which tried to emerge. Trevor-Roper argued that the Marxist interpretation was a hypothesis based on the assumption of the future rise of the industrial bourgeoisie in England. This hypothesis could be true or false: nevertheless, Trevor-Roper pointed out that it is difficult to identify the role of the English bourgeoisie in the puritan victory of 1640-1660. It is even difficult to find out any ‘bourgeois aim’ of the leaders of the puritan revolution of England in the 17th century. Therefore, the roots of the general crisis of 17th century England should be traced in certain other areas. Trevor-Roper was of opinion that the roots of the crisis must be sought in the very structure of the state and society of ancient regime. He further argued that it was a general crisis instead of a crisis of any sector or domain. It is assumed by some of the contemporary observers that the 17th century crisis was a reflection of the struggle between the ‘King’ and the ‘Estates’ or ‘Court’: for example, in Spain, the significance of the Córtes of Castile was reduced by the Spanish king; the French minister Richelieu discontinued the summoning of the meeting of Estate General; the German Emperor reduced the power and authority of

the electoral college. The same type of conflict took place between the king and the court in England, Sweden, Denmark, and other states of Europe. Trevor-Roper points out that this struggle between the king and the court in the 17th century Europe is important for understanding the general crisis; however, this constitutional struggle was not the cause of the crisis, but rather it was the form of crisis. The general crisis of the 17th century, according to Trevor-Roper, was expressed in the form of constitutional struggle between the king and the court. The causes of the crisis must be sought in the forces behind the articulation of constitutional crisis; it must also be sought in the interests represented by the king or the courts.

It is already pointed out that Trevor-Roper accepts neither the class theory of crisis proposed by the Marxist scholars nor the constitutional interpretation of crisis. According to him, it was crisis in the relationship between the society and the state in early modern Europe. He is of opinion that it was the crisis of the Renaissance society and Renaissance state that created the general crisis of the 17th century. It is pointed out by Trevor-Roper that during the 16th century, there was steady expansion of the economy and market of Europe. However, it did not lead to the structural changes of the economy. It is true about culture and politics also. Though the cultural productions of the 16th century were prolific and rich, however, it did not always raise new questions or criticize the existing practices. The political structure also remained unchanged during the 16th century; the so-called Renaissance State continuously expanded even after 1600 without changing its fundamental structure. This state, according to Trevor-Roper, was medieval in nature and ruled by the Christian aristocratic monarchy. This Renaissance State emerged at the cost of the waning of the autonomous role of the medieval cities. Moreover, the Princes invented the Renaissance Court to consolidate their rule and authority. The entire process strengthened the position of the princes in unprecedented way: it was a new culture of power that evolved around the princes with new set of power apparatuses. The increasing authority of the princes was reflected in their control over economic, cultural and religious life of the cities: the trade came to be monopolized by the princes, the church was subdued, the development of the art and architecture of the cities were also under the control of the princes. It is not that the cities did not oppose these aggressive policies of the new rulers; however, these efforts were not always successful. After 1500, the autonomous culture of the European cities was destroyed

by the Princes and their courts. Trevor-Roper also points out that the 16th century was the century of continuous economic expansion. The new state–the Renaissance State under the princes–emerged at the expense of the autonomy of the cities and appropriated the fruits of the economic expansion of Europe.

The Renaissance State as defined by Trevor-Roper was an administrative structure headed by the prince and operated by the bureaucracy. The main strength of the Renaissance State was its 'officers' or 'courtiers'–the fundamental organ of the bureaucratic structure. The most important point is that the number of the officers of the Renaissance State was continuously increasing in the 16th century. The princes required them more and more in order to establish control over the society, to govern the territory and to extract social surpluses. Therefore, the power of the princes in the Renaissance State grew largely form the command system of the newly emerging bureaucratic officers. We also must remember that there was growing demand to achieve the bureaucratic positions in the contemporary society because it opened lucrative avenues of both powers, enhanced lifestyle and status before the aspirant officers. Trevor-Roper attracts our attention to a highly interesting fact that the payment of the officers did not come from the royal coffers. It is estimated that three-quarters of the payment of the royal officers were directly or indirectly provided by the general taxpayers. The official salary was always meagre and the officers always tried to maximize their income from the private opportunities. Until the 16th century, thanks to the absence of any general price hike, the common people did not have to pay an exorbitant amount to the royal officers. However, with the passing of the 16th century, Trevor-Roper argues, there was steady increase of prices, which in turn provided an opportunity to the royal officers to extract more money form the commoners. And it is generally agreed that the casual profit of the royal offices was increased extraordinarily in the 17th century at the cost of the 'country'. It was inevitable because the princes did not have ready cash to offer to their officers; therefore, they simply granted right of exploitation to the officers. These officers were the most privileged sections of the new regime under the Renaissance State: they were granted crown land as lease on easy terms; they were authorized to collect taxes at their own wishes even irrationally or illegitimately. The officers had the right to impose new taxes on the citizens. The burden of government exploitation on the citizens became manifold as the number of offices as well as officers multiplied in

the 17th century. The creation of new offices by the greedy officers aggravated the financial crisis of the Renaissance State and society. The princes were also the beneficiaries of the entire process as they sold the offices to the aspirant bureaucrats against cash payment. Therefore, this revenue farming process generated profit both for the princes and the officers at the cost of the common masses: the country. It is needless to point out that the bureaucratic structure would soon become parasitic in nature. And the entire process would eventually reach its limit of creation of new offices and farming of revenue.

The fissure in this inherently contradictory system would not appear at the surface unless and until the economy was primarily expanding. The 16th century was such a time when the expanding economy of Europe was able to absorb contradictions within its fold. However, the cracks appeared in the political economy of the European Renaissance State by 1590. The weakness of the Renaissance State was gradually visible in the decades of 1620s and 1630s. It was coincided with the rise of the Puritanism as socio-religious ideology and decline of the idea of Renaissance in Europe: it was indeed a reaction against the Renaissance State and its court. Trevor-Roper reminds us that the reaction was obviously heterogenous in nature. For example, in England the protest came from the gentry, who suffered most from the rising taxes while in France it was the peasantry who started revolting against the oppressive system of taxation. All over Europe, the oppressed masses protested the burden of irrational and illegitimate taxes. They expressed their strong grievances against the creation of unnecessary offices. Therefore, according to Trevor-Roper, it was neither a constitutional crisis nor a crisis of production. It was a conflict between the ‘court’ and the ‘country’, and this conflict created a ‘revolutionary situation’ in Europe during 1620s and 1630s. However, it also needs to be noted that the ‘revolutionary situations’ did not always automatically culminate into a real ‘revolution’. Trevor-Roper points out that it is the responsibility of the historians to study the factors–political events and political errors–behind the transformation of a revolutionary situation to a revolution. Of course, one must study it in keeping with the mind the variations of the ‘political events’ and ‘political errors’ from place to place. The study of variations of the ‘political events’ and ‘political errors’ is important because only it can explain the heterogenous nature of the revolution from place to place and time to time. In this context, Professor Trevor-Roper further

reminds us that the crisis of the Renaissance State would have been averted if it had taken two principal measures: firstly, reduced the size of the parasitic bureaucracy; secondly, restricted the number of royal officerswithin the limits of the economy. The European state in the 17th century failed to introduce these two radical measures. However, what it did was to pursue the policy of mercantilism. The effort to adopt this desperate policy of mercantilism was however not always successful. For example, the property of the church on the one hand and the number of the offices on the other hand – both increased in Spain in the 17th century. The trade in Spain was mostly controlled by the foreigners. The dead weight of the old state structure crippled the vitality of the economy and society of Spain. The condition of Netherlands was however very different: it rejected the Renaissance Court on the one hand and adopted the policy of mercantilism on the other hand. This revitalized the economy and trade of Netherland to a significant extent in the 17th century. The situation in 17th century France was midway between Spain and the Netherlands. Unlike Spain, France was able to reduce the importance of the nobility. This reform programme under Richelieu, Mazarine and Colbert, though not revolutionary one, saved the French monarchy until 1789. One must also note that the economy of the country flourished in the 17th century. The burden of taxes, as noted by Trevor-Roper, was not imposed on the gentry, who were vocal in the parliament but on the scattered peasantry. The political reform and the adoption of mercantilism strengthened the military capability of France and rationally organized the state for power and profit. In England, however, the gentry had to bear the increasing burden of taxes under the authority of the Renaissance State and the royal authority was aware of it. Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, and the minister of King James, attempted to solve the problem. He tried to rationalize the farming of taxes and the leasing of Crown lands, to reform the royal household, to liberate the agricultural lands from the feudal shackle, abolish archaic dues in exchange for other forms of income from which the royal house, at least partially, could get additional resources. However, Salisbury was vehemently opposed by the Court; he also lost the favour of the king. Consequently, he failed to reform the parasitic system of taxation. Salisbury was followed by Francis Bacon. Bacon prescribed the same ways as his predecessor had attempted. However, history repeated itself here: the King refused to accept the proposal of Bacon to reform the financial administration of England, and Bacon was overthrown

from his post. The subsequent attempt of reform by Lionel Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex was also not successful. In this context, it is pointed out by Trevor-Roper that the English Court was till unreformed in 1640.

The Stuart government encouraged trade and commerce. Its mercantilist policy encouraged the capital formation within the English economy. It however brought economic misery and dislocation of social fabric to some sections of the society. The English state did not take any measure to address and ameliorate these mounting social tensions. The result is that when the crisis of political economy in England in the 17th century reached its highest point, the deprived and underprivileged classes of the society attempted to destroy the mechanism of exploitation. The stiff and weakened structure of the English government was no longer able to mitigate the rebel forces. The fact is that the leaders of the Long Parliament, according to Trevor-Roper, did not intend to reverse the economic policy of the Crown; they wanted just to repair the administration. For example, the Earl of Bedford as Lord Treasurer and John Pym, the Chancellor of Exchequer attempted to abolish monopolies, wardships and prerogative taxes, to reduce the expenditure and to reinforce the Stuart Court on a rational less costly basis. The Stuart Court was however never reformed, and it was not possible for the kings to introduce the reform measures, at least moderately. When the reform programme failed to reorient the kingship towards a more rational and logical foundation, the stage was captured by more radical men. Consequently, the English Court – the last Renaissance Court in Europe–was washed out. If the Stuart Kings had adopted reform programmes at the appropriate time, the destiny of the Renaissance Court would have been otherwise. Therefore, it was the failure of the royal authority of England to get reformed and rejuvenated which finally led to the crisis of the 17th century. It is clear form this analysis that it was not any bourgeois revolution, Trevor-Roper argues, that brought political revolution in England because of the general crisis of the 17th century: it was primarily a crisis of administration and authority in England. It was a crisis neither of the English Constitution nor of the production relations. It was a crisis of relation between the state and the society. The winners of the fast-changing situation in the crisis ridden 17th century England were the highly sensitive miscellany of men who revolted against the vast oppressive and parasitic bureaucratic structure of the English state. It implies that a powerful section of the society went against the king's policy of granting offices in an unending

manner. Their main intention was to rationalize the administrative and financial structure of the country and to reduce the amount of national waste. If the royal authority of England had imposed checks on the creation of unnecessary offices, the political turmoil would not have taken place. Therefore, it was the failure of the royal authority to take correct measures at the appropriate time; it was not any crisis of mode of production and not the triumph of the bourgeoisie as suggested by Hobsbawm. On the contrary, according to Trevor-Roper, it was a failure of the authority and administration of England in the 17th century. All the major European countries having Renaissance Court suffered from this general crisis of the 17th century. The ancient regime of Spain survived but the country became impoverished. France, Holland, and England witnessed the climax of the crisis. Both France and Holland were able to rationalize their courts to some extent and it saved them from total disaster. The English Court was however more rigid and failed to change itself with the changing situation of time. This failure brought revolution in England. Therefore, the crisis of administration and authority played the most significant factor in the crisis of the 17th century. And in this way, Trevor-Roper refutes the Marxist interpretation of the general crisis of the 17th century (Trevor-Roper 1959, pp. 31-64)

The argument put forward by Trevor-Roper against Hobsbawm's interpretation on the 17th century crisis generates lively debate on the question in the subsequent years. In 1960, the *Past and Present* (*Past and Present No. 18 (Nov., 1960), pp. 8-42)* published 'Discussion of H.R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century". Several scholars including Hobsbawm participated in this debate. In this Issue of the *Past and Present*, Hobsbawm replied to the questions raised by Trevor-Roper. In his short comment, Hobsbawm first made a clear distinction between the primary objective of his paper and the analysis made by Trevor-Roper. As far as Trevor-Roper's paper is concerned, it aims to understand why the revolutions of the 17th century occurred in various countries of Europe. However, we must note that Hobsbawm's approach is different: he is concerned with the economic history of the period under review. The political revolution of the 17th century is not the direct area of analysis of Hobsbawm's paper. He is however interested in search links between the crisis of the 17th century and the Industrial Revolution of the late 18th century. Hobsbawm tries to interpret the economic consequences of the crisis of the 1620s in its totality; the reference of the political

crisis, which is the fundamental question in Trevor-Roper's analysis, in Hobsbawm's paper comes as a passing one. Therefore, according to Hobsbawm, both these papers are complementary instead of competitive with each other. The Industrial Revolution of the late 18th century is possible because of the economic forces created by the 17th-century crisis, and this process of transformation took place only in England. Neither France nor the Netherlands witnessed any such transformative progressions. Hobsbawm argues that what transpires from Trevor-Roper's argument is that Europe could have escaped the crisis and political revolution of the 17th century if the Renaissance Court had reformed itself. In other words, the 17th-century political revolution was not inevitable. Hobsbawm is of opinion that the question of the inevitability of political revolution, that is the political revolution could have been avoided, is a metaphysical one. The point is not that whether the political revolution of the 17th century was inevitable or not but the long-term consequences of the entire process. According to Hobsbawm, Trevor-Roper judges the intention of political representatives of the 17th century; this way of analysis is inadequate because there is always a gap between the men's intention and the social consequences of their actions*Past and Present No. 18 (Nov., 1960), pp. 12-14).* The 17th century Revolution is bourgeois because it paved the way for the coming of the bourgeois capitalist economy in the 18th century.

In this issue of the *Past and Present*, Lawrence Stone's criticism of the argument put forward by Trevor-Roper needs to be discussed. Stone agrees with the view of Trevor-Roper that the English crisis of the 1640s was a culmination of a long-developed resentment of the Country against the Court. It was also a crisis of confidence of the Court. However, Lawrence Stone does not accept the way of using the conceptual tools of Trevor-Roper in the analysis of the 17th-century crisis. He is of opinion that the English Court and administration were small and relatively inexpensive in the early modern period. The ancient regime of England did not have a standing army; the bureaucracy was also not well paid. The number of the central bureaucracy was also limited. Even, the Stuart dynasty did not have any systematic policy for the sale of office for earning money except certain half-hearted efforts. The Crown grant to the nobility, according to Lawrence Stone, was unevenly distributed. It is estimated that only 117 of the 380 or so English nobles benefitted, and of these a mere 26 received no less than 72% of the total(*Past & Present*, No. 18 (Nov., 1960), pp. 31-32.). It is clear from Lawrence Stone's argument that a tiny majority

was indeed beneficiary of the state patronage. It was not supposed to be an articulated class that could represent its own political and economic interest in a cohesive way. The total cost to the taxpayers for the maintenance of the Court was comparatively small in England in comparison with France or Spain. Lawrence Stone points out that it was Normandy alone in contemporary France that 'provided Louis XIII with revenues equal to the total ordinary income of Charles I'. It also needs to be remembered that the English taxpayers were remarkably conscious about the cost required for the maintenance for the Court and the administration. It was because the cost of the Court and administration drained more resources even than war, between 1603 and 1641. In the decade of 1630s, however, the cost of the Court and administration decreased substantially, and Lawrence Stone suggests that if the grievances of the taxpayers had played any role in the political crisis of the 17th century England, the perfect timing of the revolution must have been the 1620s instead of the 1640s. Therefore, the causes of the 17th-century crisis in England were more than simple grievances of the taxpayers against the Crown for maintaining expansive Court and administration: it was more than any single factor whether religious or political or economic. According to Lawrence Stone, England started experiencing growing tension between two cultures: the culture of Country and the culture of Court. The weak administrative structure of the English state subsequently failed to resist the mounting pressure of the 'Country' and collapsed in the 1640 (*Past & Present*, No. 18, Nov., 1960, pp. 32-33.) Another important contribution in the debate is made by Roland Mousnier in the same issue of the *Past & Present.*

Mousnier interprets the crisis of the 17th century as an overall crisis of all aspects of human life (*Past & Present*, No. 18, Nov., 1960, pp. 18-24; Steensgaard, Niels in Parker, Geoffrey and Lesley M. Smith 2005, p. 33). It should also be mentioned that Mousnier offers an opposite argument of Trevor-Roper as far as the 'Country' versus 'Court' conflict was concerned. Mousnier shows that in many cases the feudal lords provoked the peasantry not to pay the tallies and the other numerous taxes to the government out of the fear that if the peasants had paid these taxes to the government, they would not have been able to pay the dues of the feudal lords. Even in many cases, the royal officers and the municipal magistrates asked the peasants not to pay the taxes. The rebel peasants refused to pay the taxes and drove off the government officials. The rural gentry on many occasions joined with the rebel

peasantry. The early modern cities and towns also saw similar cooperation between some sections of the royal officers and the dissident forces in the 17th century. There are pieces of evidence that the peasants often sent men to the cities for the help of the insurgents; furthermore, the royal officials also played an active role in forming the band of insurgents and paralyzed the government activities. Peasants sometimes seized the towns also. All this evidence shows that in many cases it was not a revolt of the 'Country' against the oppressive public services as suggested by Trevor-Roper; rather, it was the revolt of a public service, which considered itself oppressed. This public service dragged the peasants and other oppressed classes of the society within its fold. Therefore, the nature of the 17th-century crisis is just the opposite of what Trevor-Roper argues. Mousnier also points out that the expenses of the Court were a small fraction of the expenses of the state in the 17th century France. It was not a huge burden as put forward in Trevor-Roper's argument. The government officials were also linked with the local societies, and provided protection to them from time to time. Therefore, the government officials simultaneously represented the interests of the local societies and the king. It is clearly not a simple conflict between the 'Court' and the 'Country' as suggested in the Trevor-Roper's argument. Mousnier unhesitatingly points out that 'it was less an opposition between the country and the Court, than between what remained feudal in society and what was new,étatique, progressive, "modem" in the King's Council and its dependent organs' (*Past & Present*, No. 18 (Nov., 1960), pp. 21-22). modern

In Mousnier's argument, the importance to the economic aspects of the crisis is also attached. According to him, though Trevor-Roper discusses the role of the Thirty-Years' War in the crisis, he, however, does not pay adequate attention to the question of the steep economic crisis of the 17th century. This century witnessed bad harvests, subsistence crises, famines, plagues producing cumulative economic hardship in the life of the common masses. There was chronic economic and social distress in the two-thirds of the kingdom after plague of 1629-30. The mounting social tension and economic privation of the peasantry naturally forced them to take the side of the landlords. The peasants selected the option between the feudal dues instead of royal taxes in this struggle. They were quickly incited by the feudal lords to take arms against the royal authority. Placing the entire crisis into the conflict between the 'Court' and the 'Country', Trevor-Roper misses these significant points

in his analysis. Moreover, the political and social crisis of the 17th century must be considered as an integral aspect of the intellectual changes of the era. It includes the very perception of the universe, the scientific outlook, and the philosophical rationality (*Past & Present*, No. 18 (Nov., 1960), pp. 22-24). Therefore, it may be argued that the European approach about the society, the economy, the culture, the rationality, the philosophy – everything was at crossroad and exposed to change. And in this sense, it was truly a general crisis.

In his reply, Trevor-Roper disagrees with what Lawrence Stone argues that the cost of the Court declined in England in the 1630s. Trevor-Roper admits that it is difficult to estimate the actual cost–whether increasing or declining–of the Court. However, he presumes that burden of the Court was greater in 1630s than 1620s. According to Trevor-Roper, social crisis is not always a result of the conflict between two mutually exclusive groups: it could even be a result of conflict developing within a group. In fact one cannot identify any clear split within a group in cases of social crises. In Trevor-Roper's language, it is "untidy inward crumbling', which represents the crisis. The complexity of the human interest caused the complexity in the historical development of the 17th century Europe. It is often overlooked that the 'Court' and the 'Country' in the 17th century constantly overlapped with each other. Therefore, it is not very easy to draw a dividing line in respect of interest of the different social classes during this period of history. It is the responsibility of the historians to explain the social crisis in terms of contradiction emerging in the social structure (*Past & Present*, No. 18, Nov., 1960, pp. 35-36).

4.3 The 17th Century Crisis in Europe: Economic, Social and Political Dimensions

The 17th century crisis in Europe was multidimensional: almost all the aspects of general life of the people were affected by the crisis. The economic, social, and political dimensions of the crisis, therefore, need to be explored organically; in other words, these three dimensions of crisis must not be discussed in isolation from each other as these were not mutually exclusive. These were interconnected and interdependent with each other. Crisis in European life was manifested in the

domains of economy, society, and politics in the 17th century. In this sub-unit, we will discuss these three aspects or dimensions of the crisis in detail for the general understanding of the learners.

4.3.1 The 17th Century Crisis: The Economic and Social Dimensions

Niels Stenger (Parker and Smith 2005) in his analysis points out that the major five key areas related to early modern economy of Europe–that is, the population, agriculture, industry, international trade, and public sector–need to be discussed for an understanding of the economic dimensions of the crisis.

4.3.1.1 Population

It is beyond confusion that the European population in the 17th century declined or stagnated in comparison with that of the 16th century. However, it must be remembered that the changes in the demographic structure of Europe were not uniform or identical. There were temporal and spatial variations, which need to be contextualized in detail:

- Castile, the Italian peninsula, and Germany: These areas suffered a substantial decline of population in the first half of the 17th century.
- Catalonia: The population of Catalonia increased until 1630 continuously; however, after 1630, it stagnated.
- The Netherlands: The population graph steadily increased till the mid of the 17th century. The second half of the century saw the stagnation of population in both the north and the south of the Netherlands.
- England: Though the population of England was increased in the 17th century, however, it chiefly took place in the first half of the 17th century.
- Denmark and Poland: Both these two countries suffered from considerable population loss due to Northern War at the end of the 1650s.
- France: France began its journey in the 17th century with the growth of population. This positive pace was noticeable in northern France till 1650s while in southern France it continued up to 1675-80. During the last quarter of the century, the population of France either declined or stagnated (Parker and Smith 2005, pp. 34).

One of the basic reasons behind the long-term absence of demographic stability is the high percentage of mortality rate. In this context, we must note that the sources on which the estimate of population is based is not the nationwide census. England first conducted its census in the 19th century. The historians depend mainly on the church registers for birth and death, estate records, land records and health tax registers, and poll-tax lists for estimating the probable population structure. It is generally estimated that Europe had 100 million inhabitants in 1600, 140 million in 1700 and 188 million in 1800. However, this general demographic structure must be interpreted keeping in the mind the following fact that there were wide regional variations in early modern Europe. If we consider the data about the mortality during the period under review, we will find that there were certain factors behind it. We may first consider the high rate of child mortality in pre-industrial Europe. It is found that of every 100 children born, a good half were destined to die before the average age of marriage. Even during the normal years, the population structure could not cross the general pattern of growth. In the rural areas, the demographic structure was relatively better than the urban areas; however, the relative better demographic structure of rural Europe did not last long because of the emigration to the towns. The peasants had also attraction to the new lands. All these factors contributed to the fluctuations in the demographic structure in any given region of early modern Europe. There were other important factors too: Hunger, epidemics, and war. Geoffrey Parker points out that prolonged hunger was one of the causes of the higher mortality rate. Hunger, by weakening the immunity power of population, especially the poor sections of the society, made it a victim to epidemic diseases such as typhus, typhoid, dysentery, and especially bubonic plague. The bubonic plague caused a major setback to the demographic structure. For example, during 1628-31, the plague took away the life of almost a million people in France. In early modern Europe, the rumour of epidemics often created forced migration in different regions of Europe. Even, it interrupted the food supply and caused the exorbitant price hike. The massive migration also disturbed the labour supply and thereby obstructed the agricultural production process (Kellenbenz 1976, pp. 201; Cipolla 1974, pp. 71-72; Parker 2001, pp. 6-7).

The historians are not unanimous in assessing the impact of the war on the structure of population. Kellenbenz is of opinion that the Thirty Years' War contributed to the decline of population in Germany. However, the displacement of population by

movement from one region to another would be more in realistic term rather than in devastation. The example of the Swiss Confederation aptly illustrates this point. The population of the Confederation increased to 1,200,000 in 1700 from 1,000,000 in 1600. During this period, one must note that about 300,000 Swiss mercenaries left Switzerland; at the same time, the country received the immigrants like the French Huguenots after the Revocation of Edict of Nantes (Kellenbenz 1976, pp. 202). The changes in the demographic structure of Poland during the period under review is also instructive. In the decades of 1650-60, 1670-80 and 1710-20, there was decrease of birth rate in the country. Consequently, the population pattern stagnated during the whole period. In the Danube basin, the war between the Habsburg forces and the Ottoman Turks contributed to the forced movement of the population. The areas taken by the Habsburg Empire were in many cases completely depopulated and recolonised by the settlers who had migrated from south-west Germany and Lorraine. The Habsburg rulers also encouraged the Serbs, the Slovaks, the Wallachians, the Greeks and the Jews to settle on the Hungarian plains. It is true that in some cases, the historians overestimated the effect of war on the demographic structure; however, it is equally true that war was in many cases accompanied by epidemics. There is no doubt that the combined effect of war and epidemics had long-term impact on the population pattern of Europe in the 17th century(Kellenbenz 1976, pp. 204). Frequently, famine followed the epidemics. For example, in Geneva between 1627 and 1630, the price of grains and the number of deaths were doubled because of the combined effect of plague and famine. The social effects were no less negligible: due to the increase of death rate, baptism fell by a third and marriage by a half. The city's population declined to around 10,000 from 15,000 and stayed there for next half century. In this context, we must remember that the catastrophe like famine or war or epidemics did not occur uniformly in Europe. Parker points out that the plague did have little impact on the relatively isolated population. The urban areas were mainly ravaged by the plague. However, it is also true that some areas escaped the devastating impact of plague. For instance, Sicily experienced no plague after 1625 whereas some cities of the Kingdom of Naples lost half of their population in 1656-57. Similarly, there was no outbreak of Plague in Scotland after 1649. Interestingly, one-fifth of the population of London lost their lives in the Great Plague of 1665 (Parker 2001, pp. 7-10).

4.3.1.2 Agriculture

Niels Steensgaard argues that a comprehensive idea about the general condition of the European agriculture in the 17th century could be made based on two sets of data: the price of agricultural products and yield ratios. The 16th century saw the progressive rise of the price of the agricultural products. It came to an end in the years immediately following 1600. However, the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War (1618-48) contributed to the price rise again, however with regional variations. For example, the price rise continued in Denmark, France, and northern Italy until the 1620s, in Germany and Holland until the 1630s and in England, Belgium and Austria until the 1640s. After 1640s, the prices fell in all over Europe until the 18th century although in Germany a tendency of rise took place somewhat earlier. If the yield ratios of the agrarian production are considered, we find that there was a decline of the yield ratio in Germany in the second half of the 16th century, in England, Germany, France and eastern Europe in the first half of the 17th century, and in England, France, Germany and Scandinavia in the second half of the 17th century. Steensgaard argues that as the decline of yield ratios coincided with either the fall or the stagnation of the prices, it is an indication of the crisis on the demand side of the economy(Parker and Smith 2005, pp. 35-36).

4.3.1.3 Industry

The condition of industry in the 17th century Europe was not uniform. In Italy, for example, the wool industry started declining around 1600 and this decline phase continued in the subsequent decades of the 17th century. The stagnation of the Castilian wool industry was noticed at the end of the 16th century. Around 1620, it started experiencing the decline and subsequently in the middle of the 17th century, it was really and difficult time for the wool industry of Castile. The experience of the north-west Europe was however different: both the production and export of the woollen textile industry of this region of Europe to southern Europe, the Levant and Asia was increasing in the 17th century. Leiden–the leading Dutch textile centre–continued to flourish until 1654. At Leiden, the annual value of textile production in 1630 was 4 million fl. It increased to 9 million fl. in 1654. It is necessary here to remember that the Netherlands reorganized its textile production in the first two decades of the 17th century: by 1620s, it concentrated more on the production of

expensive goods and started lowering the production of cheaper draperies. However, total Dutch textile export to the Baltic region continued to increase until 1640s. Though adequate data is not available regarding the industrial economy of England in the 17th century, however, the export of textile products from London was stagnated after the peak year of 1614. However, this estimate does not include the lighter and cheaper new draperies. The English textile industry produced and exported the new draperies in an increasing way in the first half of the 17th century. The English rural textile industry was able to produce and export the new draperies because it was able to access the long-staple wool. There was rapid advancement of wool industry in the southern Netherlands in the beginning of the 17th century. In the second decade of the 17th century, Lille as a production centre continued to prosper. In the 1630s, however, there was noticeable regression of the economic prosperity. Another important centre of textile production in the Netherlands was Hondschoote: it continued to prosper in the third and fourth decades of the 17th century. There were signs of economic deterioration in the late 1640s; however, there was no catastrophic decline of Hondschoote as a textile production Centre during the period under review. Two important changes took place in the textile industry of the 17th century Europe. First, there was a shift of the textile production base from urban areas to the rural areas; secondly, more emphasis was put on the production of lighter cloths instead of the heavier one. In the second half of the 17th century, the Indian textile goods started dominating the European market (Parker and Smith 2005, pp. 36-38).

4.3.1.4 The Economic Crisis

Steensgaard points out that the 17th century economic crisis was not a universal phenomenon of Europe. Its impact was heterogeneous and varied from sector to sector. It is also difficult to pinpoint any precise time frame of the crisis. However, two basic points could be easily discerned: firstly, the low relative prices of the goods, especially, the agricultural products; and secondly, the declining agricultural production. The 17th century economic crisis affected the poorer sections of the society sharply: they failed to buy corn and other necessary products. It is also important to note that despite the commercial expansion of the European economy in the 16th century and the 17th century, it was predominantly a subsistence economy. It implies that any fall–even minor one–of the economy could be a ready factor behind the quick erosion of the livelihood of the peasantry or the artisans. A vast

sections of the 17th century European population did not have access to the resources. In this context, the most significant point needs to be remembered that the 17th century crisis was not a crisis a production: rather, it was a crisis of distribution(Parker and Smith 2005, pp. 43-44). An analysis of the occupational structure and wealth distribution might help us to understand the possible impact of the economic crisis. For example, in the last decade of the 17th century, the half of the total population of England, which was roughly 5½ million, did not earn as a family unit more than £20 per annum: these people were classified as labouring poor, out-servants, common seamen, soldiers, cottagers and paupers. These group pf people lived either on the verge of or below the subsistence level. There was another income group–mainly the traders, the shopkeepers, the middle clergy, and the middle peasantry–who earned £40 per annum. They stood above the subsistence level but could not be classified as prosperous. The economically prosperous group in the 17th century England earned more than £100 per annum. The richest section was the nobility and the aristocratic groups enjoying the state power and social surplus. They accounted for only 3 percent of the total population of the late 17th century England while enjoyed 14½ percent of the total income of England. The poorest sections of England constituted 62 percent of the total families while they shared less than 21 percent of the national income (Munck 1990, pp. 103-104). It clearly shows the existence of the wide disparity of income and inequality of income distribution. The other regions of the Continental Europe were not exception as far as the imbalance of income distribution was concerned. It may be argued that the fall of production and the prices–especially of the agricultural goods–and the rising socio-economic inequality fuelled the economic crisis of the 17th century Europe.

4.3.2 The 17th Century Crisis: The Political Dimensions

The political dimension of the 17th century crisis is an integral part of the changing political economy of Europe during the period under review. Trevor-Roper interprets this crisis as a conflict between the ‘Court’ and the ‘Country’. According to him, it was conflict of interest between the ‘parasitic bureaucracy’ and the ‘indignant puritanically minded country’. The recent researches however draw our attention to the more critical aspects of crisis. It is argued that Europe witnessed the rise and consolidation of the absolutist state: the rise of absolutism implied the

beginning of the end of the prevailing decentralized power structure of feudalism. Under the classical form of feudalism, the feudal lords generally enjoyed command over the entire political and socio-economic resources, social surplus and the legal structure. And this right was commonly hereditary. With the emergence of the absolutist states in different parts of Europe, this hereditary command over the local societies, especially on surplus extraction process, legal rights and political hegemony, was getting weakened. Two features of the absolutist state were noteworthy. Firstly, it imposed monopoly over the armed forces; secondly, the boundaries of the states were getting fixed. Richard Lachmann points out three distinct areas where absolutist state's strategy for strengthening its position was completely different from the previous era: (1) It started appropriating the social surplus as tax, which had been under the control of the feudal lords; (2) The absolutist state almost suspended the hereditary property rights and judicial authority of the feudal lords; these rights enjoyed so far by the feudal lords now came under the sway of the state; (3) The new state exercised more effective control over the political behaviour of the local societies. Due to its newly acquired military and financial strength, the absolutist states in early modern Europe were able to achieve sophistications in using repressive measures against any rebellious activities (Lachmann 1989, p. 141). These developments actually reflected the first phase of the state formation at the national level. The general implication is that it was an expansive, aggressive fiscal-military state. The political economy of this state was based on efficient resource management, increasing power of state at the cost of the feudal lords and consolidation of military strength. All these developments led to the hereditary customary rights of the feudal lords. Obviously, the absolutist state's attempt to curb down the long-standing rights of the feudal lords did not go without any resistance. Steensgaard points out that the revolts and resistance of the feudal lords against the kings aimed to protect the customary rights and to stop the encroachment of the state into their sovereign domain. The revolt of Naples, Palermo, the French feudal lords' opposition to the Parliament of Paris in 1640–all shared the common propositions: it was not at all any ideological battle, but against the expansion of state power at the expenses of the traditional feudal social structure. The local conditions definitely influenced the development and the outcome of the resistance to the state; however, the primary factor behind the disturbances was the state's demand for higher revenue. According

to Steensgaard, the intervention of the early modern absolutist state in the traditional domain of feudal lords disrupted the existing social relations of power: in this sense, it was revolutionary in nature itself (Parker and Smith 2005, p. 46). Therefore, political dimension of the 17th century crisis a was reflection of the conflict between the emerging power of state and feudal lords' resistance against it.

4.4 Conclusion

It is clear from this discussion and analysis that the 17th century crisis in Europe was a multi-layered phenomenon. The historians make relentless efforts to understand and explain the causal origin, the extent and nature of the crisis influencing the European history in the 17th century. In the early phase of the historical debate on the crisis, two basic lines of argument emerge. While Hobsbawm tries to locate the causal origin of the crisis in the domain of the production relations and production process, Trevor-Roper places it in the conflict between the 'Court' and the 'Country'. In the subsequent period, the historians expand the horizons of the crisis by incorporating the role of state, war, religion, culture and economy. The geographical dimensions are also added in understanding the crisis. The socio-economic and political aspects of the crisis were varied, complex and heterogenous,-both spatially and temporally. The crisis of the 17th century did not simultaneously affect all the countries of Europe. Even all the sectors of the economy were not disturbed at once. Likewise, the political dimensions of the crisis were far from unitary and homogeneity. One point is however common that the absolutist states in the 17th century Europe made wholehearted efforts to curb down the traditional power structure of feudalism, to tap the local resources ruthlessly and to consolidate the dominance of the state at any cost. It destabilized the existing power structure of Europe and has come to be interpreted as a crisis.

4.5 Model Questions

1. Identify the basic contours of the historiographical critique of the 17th century crisis in Europe.

2. What were the socio-economic dimensions of the 17th century crisis?
3. Write a note on the political dimensions of the 17th century crisis.

4.6 Suggested Readings

Cipolla, Carlo M. (Ed.) The Fontana Economic History of Europe. The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. UK: Collins/Fontana, 1974.

Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century." Author(s): Roland Mousnier, J. H. Elliott, Lawrence Stone, H. R. Trevor-Roper, E. H. Kossmann, E. J. Hobsbawm and J. H. Hexter. *Past & Present*, No. 18 (Nov., 1960), pp. 8-42.

Dewald, Jonathan. "Crisis, Chronology, and the Shape of European Social History". *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 113, No. 4 (Oct., 2008), pp. 1031-1052.

Elliott, J. H. "Revolution and Continuity in Early Modern Europe". *Past & Present*, No. 42 (Feb., 1969), pp. 35-56.

Hobsbawm, E. J. "The General Crisis of the European Economy in the 17th Century". *Past & Present,* No. 5 (May, 1954), pp. 33-53.

Hobsbawm, E. J. "The Crisis of the 17th Century—II". *Past & Present*, No. 6 (Nov., 1954), pp. 44-65.

Goldstone, Jack A. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World: Population Change and State Breakdown in England, France, Turkey, and China*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Kellenbenz, Hermann. *The Rise of the European Economy. An Economic History of Continental Europe from the Fifteenth to-the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1976.

Kindleberger, Charles P. "The Economic Crisis of 1619 to 1623".*The Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Mar., 1991), pp. 149-175.

Lachmann, Richard. "Elite Conflict and State Formation in 16th- and 17th-Century England and France". *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (Apr., 1989), pp. 141-162

Mousnier, Roland, J. H. Elliott, Lawrence Stone, H. R. Trevor-Roper, E. H.Kossmann, E. J. Hobsbawm and J. H. Hexter. "Discussion of H. R. Trevor-Roper: "The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century." *Past & Present*, No. 18 (Nov., 1960), pp. 8-42.

Munck, Thomas. *Seventeenth Century Europe. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598-1700*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Parker, Geoffrey. *Europe in Crisis, 1598-1648*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

Parker, Geoffrey and Lesley M. Smith. (Eds.). *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Parker, Geoffrey. "Crisis and Catastrophe: The Global Crisis of the Seventeenth Century Reconsidered".*The American Historical Review*, Vol. 113, No. 4 (Oct., 2008), pp. 1053-1079

Rabb, Theodore K. *The Struggle for Stability in Early Modern Europe*. New York: OUP, 1975.

Steensgaard, Niels. "The Seventeenth-Century Crisis and the Unity of Eurasian History". *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (Oct., 1990), pp. 683-697.

Trevor-Roper, H.R. "The General Crisis of the 17th Century". *Past & Present*, No. 16 (Nov., 1959), pp. 31-64.

Trevor-Roper, H.R. *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century. Religion, the Reformation and Social Change*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, Inc, 1967.

Vries, Jan de. "The Economic Crisis of the Seventeenth Century after Fifty Years". *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 40, No. 2, The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: Interdisciplinary Perspectives (Autumn, 2009), pp. 151-194.

Unit 5 ❑ The Thirty Years War

Structure

5.0 Objectives

5.1 Introduction

5.2 The Thirty Years' War: Protracted Evolution

5.2.1 The Crisis in Bohemia

5.2.2 The War: The Defeat of Frederic V and the Restoration of Ferdinand II in Bohemia

5.2.3 The Danish Intervention in the War (1624)

5.2.4 The Edict of Restitution and the Treaty of Lübeck, 1629

5.2.5 The Swedish Intervention in the War: Gustavus II Adolphus and Swedish Politico-Military Projects (1629-34)

5.2.6 France, Sweden and the German Wars, 1635-1648

5.2.7 Peace of Westphalia (1648)

5.3 Conclusion

5.4 Model Questions

5.5 Suggested Readings

5.0 Objectives

- The learners will get an idea of origin, spread and end of the Thirty Years War in this unit.
- The religious, political and territorial issues behind the origins of the war will be discussed.
- The protracted nature and evolution of the war over thirty years will also be analysed.
- The Peace of Westphalia along with its terms and conditions will come under analysis.

5.1 Introduction

The Thirty Years' War was the most prolonged devastating war in the history of early modern Europe involving all the major European powers, geographical extent and religious groups in an unprecedented scale. It was not a single war fought between two countries or between two opposing alliances. It was also not war in which all the powers participated at the same time. The different European powers joined the war according to their own conveniences. Religious factor played important role in the war; however, it was not the sole cause behind the spread and continuity of the war in an unprecedented way. Politics, economy and the conflicting national-territorial interests also played equally significant role not only in the articulation of war but also in the prolonged continuousness of war.

Though the Thirty Years' War began initially as a conflict between the two contending religious ideologies of the Christian world–that is, Catholicism and Protestantism – however, eventually in the subsequent period, it ended as a struggle to diminish the influence of the Habsburg forces. Ferdinand II (c. 1619-1637), the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, made an attempt to unify the empire under the Catholic hegemony. Most of the wars took place in the lands of the Holy Roman Empire, and it is not unnatural that this prolonged war had devastating impact on the contemporary population. Thomas Munck has identified the complexities of the Thirty Years' War from the multiple viewpoints. Firstly, it could be seen as the first major European conflict, the first general war, between the Habsburg power and the rebellious subject during 1618 and 1635. Secondly, this war could also be explained as an integral part of the long-term conflict between two major European political authorities–the dynasties of France and both the branches of the Habsburg dynasties. Thirdly, the war was related to the French search for secured frontier on the one hand and Spanish concern for its north Italian possessions. Fourthly, the Dutch quest for emancipation from the Spain's dominance between 1621 and 1648 also played important role in the contours of the war. Fifthly, the involvement of Denmark and Sweden in the war was equally significant in the history of the Thirty Years' War. Sixthly, the religious outlook of the German princes, whether in favour or in opposition to Calvinism, Catholic Counter Reformation movement and Lutheran

ideology. Seventhly, the strategic and commercial interest of the different European powers like the Dutch and the British in the Baltic region intensified the conflict(Munck 1990, pp. 1-2). Therefore, it was an extremely complex, multi-layered sequences of events involving multiple sorts of interests, often conflicting in nature. In this unit, we will study the causal origin, the events and the consequences of the Thirty Years' War in detail.

5.2 The Thirty Years' War: Protracted Evolution

The Thirty Years' War is an exceptional war because it was neither pre-planned nor pre-designed: it was not a war consciously conceived and executed by the contemporary powers of Europe over a thirty years span. No European power desires war; however, the war took place and continued for thirty years involving all the major powers of Europe though not simultaneously. The historians are also divided about the origin, nature and consequences of the Thirty Years' War. Some historians have interpreted it as the last phase of the religious war of the 16th century while others construe is as a struggle of the European states to move from the predominantly feudal phase of history to bourgeois phase of history. The war is also interpreted as a part of the process of state formation. A group of scholars argue that it was a German civil war where the other European powers entered and manipulated its course of development. Some scholars even see it not simply as a German civil war but as a European civil war with a larger panorama.Therefore, it was clearly a complex flow of events, actions and reactions of the multiple powers. That is why, the scholars are not unanimous about the origin, nature and consequences of the Thirty Years' War.

We may start our discussion with the analysis of the issues of the war. It will help us to understand the shifting patterns of the Thirty Years' War in terms of religion, political economy and international relationships. First was the issue of Bohemia. The central issue of Bohemia was the relationship between the king and the subjects. The second central issue was the relationship of the Holy Roman Emperor and the princes. One common feature of both was the question of regional liberty. Another pertinent issue was the expansionist policy of Sweden specially in the Baltic region.

The relationship between Spain and France was also one of the major issues, which influenced the course of events profoundly. The Dutch aspiration for independence also played a critical role in the evolution of a war spanning over thirty years. Amongst these issues of state and politics, the issues of religion and religious practices emerged and shaped the future of Europe to a great extent. All the competing religious genres–the Catholics, the Lutherans, the Calvinists and the other Protestant groups–struggled for securing their space and dominance in time of fluidity and transition (Sturdy 2002, pp. 27-28). This analytical presentation gives us clues to understand this complex historical phenomenon in a rational way and chronological manner. In this unit, we will unfold these central issues of the Thirty Years' War in the perspectives of time and space of the first half of the 17th century Europe.

5.2.1 The Crisis in Bohemia

The complex political and religious developments in Bohemia and its relationship with the Holy Roman Empire ignited the fire for the first explosion in the early phase of the 17th century. The conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism was the most important sources of religious-political instability in the 16th and the early 17th century Europe. In order to solve the problem, the Peace of Augsburg (1555) had recognised the division of the German lands between the Catholics and the Protestants. The peace of Augsburg aimed to bring peace and stability in land ruled by the Holy Roman Empire by adopting the following measures (Munck 1990, pp. 2-3):

a. The German lands were divided between Catholicism and Lutheranism according to the decision of each prince.
b. The secularisation of the church property, which had become part of the Lutheran areas, was also acknowledged.
c. An additional Imperial Edict called Ecclesiastical Reservation was issued. According to this Edict, if a ruler of an independent ecclesiastical territory was converted, he should lose his benefice and privileges. It implies that such territories would remain Catholic through election of a new incumbent. Though it was attached to the Peace, the Protestants were not ready to accept it. Initially, it did not create any tension because there was also a secret imperial declaration

by which it was covertly decided that religious toleration would be practiced in such cases, that is, the territories which had been practicing Protestantism.

In the long run, however, the Peace of Augsburg was not successful in bringing a stable religious and political settlement in the entire region. The fundamental factor behind the failure of the Peace of Augsburg was that the Protestants did not agree to the to this edict, though it was a part of the agreement. There was a secret imperial declaration ensuring the religious toleration for those ecclesiastical dominions already practicing Protestantism. However, in the long run, it did not work. The increasing secularization of church property after 1582 destabilized the religious relationship and Ecclesiastical Reservation became the central bone of contention between the Protestants and the Catholics. It is true not only for the confessional disputes, but also in such cases where a Protestant could act as an 'administrator' of a see or benefice. The precise rights and entitlements of the Protestant administrators were questioned. The growing strength of the Calvinism was also not recognised in the Peace of Augsburg (Munck 1990, p. 3). In this context, an understanding of the religious configuration of Bohemia will help us to analyse the situation. Bohemia in general had a long tradition of non-conformism. In the 14th and 15th century, the influence of John Huss was immense in this region, and consequently, a kind of non-Catholic religious ideology emerged here. In the 16th century, Lutheranism along with Calvinism and the Bohemian Brethren proliferated in Bohemia and reduced the strength of Catholicism significantly. In the early 1600s, only 10 percent of the population still remained Catholic in this region. The University of Prague was also an important centre of Protestantism reflecting the radical consciousness of the period. The Bohemian Diet was also dominated by the Protestants (Sturdy 2002, pp. 29-30).During the reign of Maximilian II (1563-1576)–the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire–despite the resolute opposition of the Catholics, the Protestants were able to consolidate their religious position and organizational structure. The Emperor Maximillian II was covertly Lutheran in his belief though he never abandoned the Catholic belief publicly. The sympathetic attitude of the emperor helped the Protestants to freely preach their belief and doctrine among the people. In 1568, Maximillian II allowed his Austrian nobles to convert to Lutheranism if they wished so. Consequently, Protestantism spread even in Austria and Bohemia, which were outside the terms of Peace of Augsburg. Both Calvinism and Anabaptism reached the eastern reaches of

the Habsburg Empire. By the 1580s, the following regions came to be influenced by the Protestantism: Moravia, Lusatia, Habsburg Hungary, upper and lower Austria. This rapid spread of Protestantism alarmed the Catholic opponents; it was felt that some strong actions on the part of the Catholics were urgently required to stop the spread of Protestantism in the traditional Catholic lands. The signs of changes appeared with the accession of Rudolph II (1576-1612) to the throne as Emperor. The Wittelsbach dynasty in Bavaria created pressure on the Emperor Rudolph II to stop the expansion of the Protestant influence. The Wittelsbach dynasty was traditionally supporter of the Tridentine Catholic Reformation Movement from 1569. In the southern parts of the Empire, the Jesuits and the Capuchins also offered resistance to the Protestant activities. In 1578, Rudolph II ordered the expulsion of the Protestant preachers from Vienna. He also imposed restrictions on the worship of the Protestants. In 1595, the reaction of the Protestants came in the form of peasant revolt against the repressive measures of the Rudolph government; however, it failed. The continuous anti-Protestant measures destabilized the religious and social relationships of the Empire in the first half of the 17th century. Even family rift occurred due to the blinkered religious policy of Rudolph II: Rudolph's younger brother Archduke Matthias openly revolted against him. In 1608, a compromise was made between Rudolph II and Archduke Matthias. However, in 1609, the Emperor was bound to issue the 'Letter of Majesty' granting religious toleration to both Protestants and Catholics living in the Estate of Bohemia.It also created the 'Bohemian Protestant State Church under the Estate of Bohemia.By the Letter of Majesty, the Estate of Bohemia got religious autonomy (Munck 1990, pp. 3-4; Sturdy 2002, pp. 19-20).

The development of Protestantism was also problematic. The bigger threat to the Lutheran brand of the Protestant theology came not from Catholicism but from the followers of Calvin. Moreover, the followers of Luther were already divided into two groups: orthodox Gnesio-Lutheran and the more liberal but less resolute Philipists (followers of Philip Melancthon). The leader of the Gnesio-Lutherans was Matthias FlaciusIllyricus (1520-1575), who blamed the Philipsts for 'synergism' – the notion that humans cooperated in their salvation. The Formula of Concord made an effort to unify the two opposing streams of Protestant theological propositions in 1578-80. However, it did so with an inclination towards more narrow fundamentalist theological

position. The Lutheran theology primarily believed in the secular supremacy of the state or the prince. As it was associated with the ideology of state, the Lutheran theology championed conservative outlook in comparison with the other brands of the Protestantism. The Calvinist theological proposition politically was far less submissive. The situation became more complicated because Calvinism was not recognised in the Peace of Augsburg. Therefore, it was the greatest challenge to the existing confessional balance. Calvinism was also successful in spreading its influence in different parts of Europe between 1556 and 1613.It got foothold in Palatinate, Nassau, Anhalt, Hessen-Kassel Württemberg, and finally Brandenburg. The princes of these states were eager to arrest the increasing influence of the Imperial Assembly. Even they apprehended that the grant of taxation for an army supposed to fight against the Turks could be mobilized against them also. The mounting tension between the two groups eventually prepared the ground for the formation of two opposing alliances. In May 1608, the Union ofAuhausen was formed by a group of the Protestant rulers with Calvinist orientation. It was led by prince Christian of Anhalt – the advisor of Elector's Palatine. However, the absence of Johann Georg of Saxony in the League crippled it from the beginning. In 1609, the Catholic princes revived an older league in Munich under the leadership of Maximilian of Bavaria. It was also weak because the emperor did not join the League (Munck 1990, pp. 4-6). In this context, we must note that the formation of both the Catholic League and Protestant Union did not indicate the inevitability of war between the two contending forces. These two could be considered as pressure groups aiming to secure interest either of the Catholics or the Protestants. It is highly important to note that both the parties looked for external force for protection. But it was also clear to everybody that any intervention of the French or the Spanish power could convert the 'support' provided by the foreign powers into 'control'(Sturdy 2002, pp. 23).

The succession issues of the different territories like Jülich, Cleves, Mark, Berg and Ravensberg in north-western Germany in 1609 created tension in the region. However, war between the two groups were averted finally. The weakness of the imperial institutions was another factor for which the growing conflict between the two contending forces could not be tamed.Emperor Matthias (1612-1619) was also not a capable ruler to ensure stability in his empire.It slowly became clear by 1617 that the imperial succession would become a critical issue. The interest of Spanish

imperial interest in the German affairs made the matter more complicated. All the conflicting parties knew that the truce of 1609 between the Netherlands and Spain was going to expire in 1621. Spain's imperial interest was related to security of the 'Spanish Road' from the northern Italy to the Netherlands. All these factors increased the political and religious tension in the German lands (Munck 1990, pp. 6).

Despite the increasing tension in the region under the conflict between Catholics and the Protestants, the war was not seen to be an inevitable affair in the first half of the 17th century Bohemia.The Habsburg dynasty ruled Bohemia as elected kings for nearly a century. The conflict between the princes and their territorial Estates was a common affair in the early modern Europe. The dukes of Bavaria were able to establish their firm control on the Estates; however, in Württemberg or in Saxony, the Estates enjoyed greater autonomy in respect of taxation, religious matters and even of conduct of war. The Habsburg rulers were aware of the importance of Bohemia. Economically it was one of the most prosperous regions of the empire.It must also be noted that Bohemia was backbone of the Holy Roman Empire. It contributed more money and troops than any other territory of the empire. The population of Bohemia was four million, and in accordance with the 17th century standard, it was thickly populated region. As far as the religious liberty was concerned, the Letter of Majesty of 1609 granted considerable concessions to the different brands of the Protestants. The Hussite, Lutheran, Calvinist and other religious groups under the Bohemian crown enjoyed security from the pressure of the Counter Reformation Movement. Nevertheless, it created complex political and religious condition in Bohemia. Rudolph II preferred Prague as his capital and lived as an eccentric recluse. However, much of his nobility had loyalty towards the Habsburg rule. The year 1617 was critical in the history of Bohemia: in this year, Archduke Ferdinand was recognised as the King of Bohemia. In 1618, he became the King of Hungary. Ferdinand was a supporter of the Catholic Counter Reformation movement. He was educated by the Jesuits with a strong inclination towards Spain. It indicated a shift from the policy of religious toleration to a pro-Catholic religious programme in Bohemia. The change in the religious policy was manifested from the following incidents: closure of Protestant churches, censorships and other forms of repressive measures against the Protestants. It contributed to the birth of agitation and protest among the Protestants in Bohemia. In 1618, eventually, a Protestant assembly was convened in Prague to

protest against the growing intolerant religious policy of the Habsburg ruler favouring the Catholics and repressing the other religious groups following the terms of the Letter of Majesty. The Protestant leaders appealed to the emperor regarding the curbing of the religious liberty; nevertheless, it was rejected. A delegation was sent to the governor's room in the Hradschin Palace in Prague on May 23, 1618 with the demand that the Letter of Majesty be observed. After a brief deliberation, the two governors-Martinic and Slavata–along with their secretary–Fabricius-were thrown out of a high window: this dramatic event came to be known as The Defenestration of Prague (1618) in history (The origin of the word 'Defenestration' is the Latin word 'Fenestra', which means 'window'). All three survived; however, it was symbolic act reminding the Defenestration of 1419. It was symbol of revolt against the authority. This incidence changed the political situation in Bohemia completely. The Protestants nobles sent message of disloyalty to Matthias and Ferdinand. They formed a provisional government with thirty-six directors. Ferdinand was also not ready to make any compromise with the rebel Protestants because he was elected King of Hungary during this period. It reinforced his position and drove away the possibility of any chance of reconciliation between the two groups (Sturdy 2002, pp. 29, 35; Munck 1990, pp. 7-8).

5.2.2 The War: The Defeat of Frederic V and the Restoration of Ferdinand II in Bohemia

All these developments led to the consolidation of the Protestant unity in Bohemia. A confederation was formed to protect the religious liberty of the Protestants granted under the Letter of Majesty: it included Moravia, Silesia and Upper and Lower Lusatia. The rebel soon established a directory along with a military command. In 1619, the meeting of the special General Diet was convened to review the Constitution of Bohemia. It affirmed the electoral nature of the crown, designated war, finance, and the appointment of ministers as spheres in which royal decisions required the approval of Diet, and proclaimed the 'Letter of Majesty' 'fundamental law'. Diplomatic messages were sent to the different powers explaining the causes of the revolt and trying to gain legitimacy. The revolt spread to Upper and Lower Austria. Bethlen Gabor–the Prince of Transylvania–provided assistance to the rebels. In June, the rebels besieged Vienna. However, this attempt became unsuccessful because the rebel force did not get any assistance from the external forces. New

developments took place after the death of emperor Matthias in March 1619: the General Diet in its meeting on August 19, 1619, issued a decree which replaced the old Constitution by new one. Therefore, the election of Ferdinand as the King of Bohemia became null and void. On August 22, 1619, the Estate General of the Bohemian Kingdom formally deposed Ferdinand and selected the Calvinist Elector Palatine, Frederick V as their King. He was crowned on November 4, 1619 (Sturdy 2002, pp. 36-37; Munck 1990, p. 8).

Frederic V's acceptance of the kingship of Bohemia made full-scale war inevitable in Europe. However, in 1618-19, nobody knew that it would take a pan-European character and last for next thirty years. Everybody expected that it would be a limited scale regional war. In reality, it was the first international war involving all the major contemporary powers of Europe and continued for the next three decades. The military-diplomatic position of Frederic V was weak if it is compared with that of Ferdinand. Frederic who did not have any real connection with Bohemia. It was not that he was a respected personality with political wisdom and military skill. He was heavily influenced by Christian of Anhalt. He got some support from the Protestant princes but from the rest of Europe there was hardly any assistance. Under the command of Ernst von Mansfeld, an army was sent by Duke of Savoy. The support of the other Princes was insignificant. Ferdinand, on the other hand, was given assistance by Spain and Maximilian of Bavaria. Johann Georg of Saxony–a Lutheran elector – extended his support to Ferdinand as he had the ambition in Upper and Lower Lusatia. This division between the Lutheran and the Calvinists weakened the Bohemian rebels internally. The Evangelical Union gradually withdrew itself and created distance from Frederic. Finally, in the Battle of White Mountain (1620), the rebel army under the leadership of Christian of Anhalt was defeated by the joint armies of Ferdinand II, Holy Roman Emperor, led by Charles Bonaventure de Longueval, Count of Bucquoy, and the German Catholic League under Johann Tserclaes, Count of Tilly. This defeat of Frederic effectively ended the Bohemian revolt against the Holy Roman Empire. The Habsburg rule was now imposed on Bohemia. Frederic and his family fled to the Netherlands. Ferdinand completed his occupation of Bohemia and Moravia. Johann Georg of Saxony occupied Upper and Lower Lusatia and Silesia (Sturdy 2002, pp. 38-39; Munck 1990, p. 8).

This defeat obviously made the Bohemian nobility depressed. The failure in the battle and the complete isolation from the international situation were a blow to the status and prestige of the nobles. They also failed to mobilize the rural masses in support of their cause. The victorious Ferdinand imposed repressive measures on the Bohemian population. The lands of the rebel leaders were widely confiscated. There was execution of 26 rebel leaders in June 1621. One estimate shows that 680 noble families in Bohemia, 250 in Moravia and many other families suffered humiliation. Their lands were confiscated and peace and safety if their families were not at all secured. Many fled to nearby Saxony and Silesia and took shelter there. The loss of the Protestants means the gain of the Catholics, at least some of them if not all. The principal beneficiaries were the Bohemian Catholic Magnet families including Liechtensteins, the Lobkovics and the Martinic and Slavata. The Eggenbergers were also the beneficiaries of the Catholic victory. Albrecht von Wallenstein (Waldstein) was the notable beneficiary of the Ferdinand II's victory. Wallenstein took the side of the Catholics and got landed estates worth 1.9 million florins. Many non-Catholic nobles were forced to sell their lands. In many cases, the Catholics, who provided support to the Protestant rebels, were fined heavily. One important point is that the most of the new land owners were Bohemian Catholics; however, a significant proportion of the new estate holders were foreigners. They were Germans, Spanish, French, Irish, Italians, Scots and other. There was a drastic trans formation of land ownership in Bohemia and other adjoining erstwhile Protestant lands. Before the establishment of the Catholic supremacy in Bohemia, the nobility enjoyed autonomy: it undermined the Habsburg rule in this region. The victory of Ferdinand II not only transformed the land ownership structure but also the political equation of the Bohemian region. The new landlords were Catholics in their religious orientation and pro-Habsburg in political understandings. In other words, Ferdinand II–a Catholic ruler-was successful in creating his support base in an erstwhile predominantly Protestant region. The Papal nuncio (*nuncio means 'envoy' or 'messenger': the word is derived fromthe ancient Latin word 'nuntius'. Nuncio is an ecclesiastical diplomat*) in Vienna supported the Ferdinand's repressive policy to the Protestants in Bohemia. The rural peasantry started reacting against the religious and fiscal policies of the Catholic state of Bohemia. In 1621, 1622, 1624 and 1627 the peasants revolted against the high rate of taxes although these attempts were failed and the resistance

movements were suppressed. The new forms of government promulgated in 1627 terminated all sorts of religious coexistence in Bohemia and in the 1628 in Moravia respectively.The new political arrangement made the Bohemian crown hereditary in the Habsburg family (Munck 1990, pp. 8-10; Sturdy 2002, p. 39).

The deliberate method adopted by Ferdinand II to change the ownership structure of land in Bohemia and Moravia was followed by the progress of Counter-Reformation Movement in this region. Stern policies were adopted as well as quickly executed with by the newly constituted government to eliminate the Protestant elements from the society. However, Ferdinand II promised to the elector of Saxony that the Protestants of Lusatias and Silesia would be treated more softly than the Protestants of Bohemia and Moravia. He introduced series of laws to eliminate the Protestant influences from the day-to-day life of Bohemia between 1621 and 1627 with the assistance of Leichtenstein. He also depended on the newly formed Catholic landholding class in Bohemia and Moravia to accomplish the task. The following measures were taken to convert the Protestant Bohemia to a Catholic one:

- The Protestant churches were ordered to be closed.
- Mass scale conversion to Protestantism was initiated.
- Heavy fine was imposed on those who refused to be converted.
- The Jesuit and other religious orders were requested to supervise the mass conversion and its progress.
- Jesuit colleges were established in major towns. The Jesuits were also held responsible to impose censorship on books.
- The University of Prague was turned into a Catholic institution.
- The Letter of Majesty was revoked in 1627.
- The members of nobility who were not converted yet were given a period of six months to sell their property and leave the country. By 1628, 150,000 nobles left Prague for safe home.

The effect of this pro-Catholic rules brought a total transformation of Bohemia and Moravia. In 1620s, 90 percent of the total population of this region was Protestant. In 1630s, it became a Catholic country. Catholicism was fully restored in Bohemia and Moravia.

5.2.3 The Danish Intervention in the War (1624)

The Habsburg victory in Bohemia and Moravia did not lead to the logical end of the crisis in the sphere of the 17th century European politics. On the contrary, it actually geared up tension and conflict in new spheres with new players. The Habsburg victory in central and southern Europe created the possibility of new balance of power among the European states, which alarmed France, the Netherlands and England. As a response, these three countries formed a defensive alliance in 1624 to ensure mutual assistance. The Netherlands was in the apprehension of the possible Spanish intervention in its land. Philip IV (1621-1665)–the King of Spain–always considered the Netherlands his primary objective: the principal imperial concern of Spain was to secure the military routes between Italy and the Netherlands. In 1621, the Twelve-Year Truce between Spain and the Netherlands expired. Following the 'Netherlands First' strategy, Philip IV resumed war with the Netherlands. The Dutch power tried to encourage the opposition to the Hapsburgs in Germany. Nevertheless, Wallenstein–the military commander of Ferdinand II–defeated the Dutch-subsidized army led by Ernest, Count of Mansfeld at Dessau (25 April 1626). The King of Denmark–Christian IV–intervened in the politico-religious matters of the German lands in this context. He was moved by religious concerns as well as by commercial and political interests. Christian IV stood for the Protestant liberty on the one hand. On the other hand, he had political interest in Germany. Holstein, which was the southernmost province of the Denmark, lay within Holy Roman Empire and formed part of the lower Saxon circle. As a duke of the Holstein (but not as a King of Denmark), he was also a prince of the empire. Moreover, Christian's kingdom was fairly extensive covering Denmark, Norway, Greenland and Iceland. He was a ambitious ruler aiming to play role in the German politics. It would not be irrelevant to mention here that Christian IV had blood relation with Germany: his father, Frederic II was a half-German while his mother princes Sophie of Mecklenburg was fully a German lady. He married Princes Anne of Brandenburg. Even, it was the common practice in the court of Denmark that German was used instead of Danish. The sons of the Danish nobles usually studied in the Protestant universities of Germany. The commercial interest also played a major role in the formulation of the aggressive foreign policy of Denmark. It controlled the maritime trade route between

the Baltic and the North Sea via the narrow belts and sounds which threaded their way around the islands between mainland Denmark and Norway. Two principal fortresses under the Danish control-Elsinor on the Danish side and Helsingborg on the Norwegian side–controlled the maritime trading route and collected taxes from the ships. It was one of the principal sources of income of Denmark. This lucrative income made Denmark independent in relation to the other European states. Christian IV wanted to expanded Danish maritime supremacy in north-west Germany around the mouths of Elbe with its port of Hamburg, and the Weser with Bremerhaven and Bremen. Christian IV's chief aim was to establish monopoly on the custom dues of north-west Germany. Therefore, the political, territorial, Belts and Sounds: It is related to the Danish Straits connecting Baltic Sea and North Sea. There are Five straits called belt (Danish: *bælt*). The other straits are called 'sound' (Danish, Swedish and German: *sund*). If an island is situated between a 'belt' and a 'sound', generally the bigger strait is called 'belt' and the thinner one is the 'sound'. The Germanic word 'sound' originates either from the verb 'to sunder', that is, 'to separate' or from 'to swim'. In the Swedish language, any strait is called 'sound'. The German word 'sound' does not have any relationship with word 'sound' of the Romance languages. The 'sound' in Romance word originated from the Latin word 'sonus'.

Military and religious interests of Denmark in German affairs appeared to be legitimate and logical to Christian IV, and thereby the inevitability of intervention in Germany (Munck 1990, pp. 11-12; Sturdy 2002, p. 50-51; Cameron 2001, pp. 210-211).

A realistic assessment of the circumstances did not however indicate a rosy picture for Denmark. The decision of Christian IV to interfere in the German affairs has been considered by the historians as erroneous and miscalculated. This decision was a result of political cynicism and arrogance. Firstly, the anti-Habsburg alliance was never materialized. Secondly, the expected help from England was not received by Christian IV. Thirdly, the financial resources and military capability of Denmark was overestimated by the Danish king. All these mistakes finally ensured Christian IV's defeat in the battle of Lutter (August 27, 1626). It was a crushing blow upon the Protestant forces by Johan Tzerclaes, Count of Tilly, the Catholic League

General. Throughout 1627 and 1628, the imperial force exerted enormous pressure on Christian IV, who was fighting actually a lonely battle. The Catholic forces occupied Mecklenburg, Pomerania and other northern territory. Wallenstein finally invaded Denmark in 1627, and forced the Danish army to surrendered. These series of defeatsforced the Danish forces to leave the northern Germany and finally withdraw from the warin 1629 (Munck 1990, pp. 12-13; Sturdy 2002, p. 51-54; Cameron 2001, pp. 210-211).

5.2.4 The Edict of Restitution and the Treaty of Lübeck, 1629

All the victories of Ferdinand against the Protestant forces brought a vast territory in central and eastern Europe under the direct Habsburg control and Catholic orbit. Ferdinand took it a as a result of divine intention. Now he started thinking to rectify the error committed to the Catholics in the Peace of Augsburg, 1555 as his predestination.Consequently, on March 6, 1629, Ferdinand issued the Edict of Restitution. The leading religious personalities of Catholic genre were consulted before finalizing the Edict. However, the Imperial Diet was not taken into confidence for discussion because the Protestant members of the Diet might question the necessity of this step. Ferdinand had consulted his Jesuit confessor William Lamormaini and the archbishop of Mainz. By the Edict of Restitution, he ordered all Catholic lands in Germany which had turned Protestant since the Treaty of Passau (1552) to be restored to Catholicism. It reversed the status of two archbishoprics (Bremen and Magdeburg), twelve bishoprics, more than fifty monasteries and convents as well as numerous towns and villages. In replying to his critics, Ferdinand justified his position that he had only rectified the Protestant infringements into the Catholic order since 1555. In many cases, the clauses of the Treaty of Augsburg were violated by the act of the Protestants; his intention was only to correct it. Ferdinand further argued that the victory of the imperial forces had already restored Catholicism in vast regions. The Edict only formalized it. It strictly represented the Catholic view that the secularization of church lands since 1552 was illegal and that only those Protestants adhering to the Confession of Augsburg had been included in the provisions of the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. Calvinism was proscribed as a religion in the Empire. Imperial commissioners were deputed to enforce Catholicism in the public life. The Catholic victory and the Edict of Restitution completely transformed the politico-

religious scenario of central and eastern Europe. Richard Bonney points out that before 1629 the principal question was that whether the emperor had the capability and might to enforce a decision to restore Catholicism in a land which had already been converted to Protestantism or not: it was not supposed to be a question of right of the ruler. The Edict of Restitution was the sign of changing situation as far as religious questions were concerned after the triumph of Catholic forces in the Habsburg lands(Sturdy 2002, p. 55-56; Bonney 1991, p. 194).

The Catholic electors had doubts about the legality of the Edict. They were not opposed to the clauses of the Edict but also in the ways it was promulgated. They argued that the provisions should be scrutinized in the Imperial Diet. Subsequently, there was division between the Habsburg and Wittelsbach dynasties in the question of occupying the reconstituted prince bishoprics. In this competition, the Habsburgs were able to occupy Magdeburg, Bremen, Hildesheim and Halberstad. These were the major bishoprics. The less important Osnabrück, Minden and Verden were acquired by the Wittelsbach. However, the elector reacted by dismissing Wallenstein from the post of Imperial generalissimo in August 1630. The Catholic electors, on the one hand, considered him as the man of low social status. On the other hand, the electors were apprehensive of the military capability of Wallenstein being a commander of 150,000 men. Moreover, the Catholic electors also refused to elect Ferdinand II's son as the King of the Romans. This refusal actually questioned the Habsburg right of succession to the Imperial title. The size of the imperial army was reduced. The electors introduced new ways of financing the army, which was less acceptable to the emperor. Tilly was appointed commander of both the Imperial and Catholic League armies; however, provisions were made to keep the two armies separate from each other (Bonney 1991, p. 194-195). All these were the signs of internal rift of the Habsburg imperial administration and its policies. It encouraged the anti-Habsburg forces to consolidate their military strength and develop future planning to curb down the growing power of the Habsburg Empire.

Another major aspect of the Ferdinand II's policy during this period was related to his negotiation with Denmark. Ferdinand thought it was the right time to make a treaty with Christian IV in terms favourable to Habsburg Empire. The Habsburg King viewed the Danish King as a defeated and lost entity upon which crushing terms

could be imposed. Ferdinand wanted to take a sizeable portion of Jutland and to impose heavy indemnity on Christian IV. He also thought of constituting a Commission of Confiscation: it will cease property of those who assisted Denmark in the war. Wallenstein, however, rejected this idea of Ferdinand II as dangerous. He, on the contrary, advised Ferdinand II to treat Christian IV leniently. Wallenstein apprehended that such hard and ruthless measures might trigger to develop an anti-Catholic and pan-Protestant unity among the German princes. Ferdinand II agreed to Wallenstein though not without reluctance. Consequently, Wallenstein negotiated with Christian IV's representatives and finally terms of treaty were settled. The Treaty of Lübeck was signed on May 22, 1629. Denmark was allowed to retain Jutland and did not have to pay any indemnity. In return, however, he had to give up his claims to German bishoprics. He also made promise that he would remain neutral in case of war in future involving the emperor. The Treaty of Lübeck confirmed the victory of the conciliatory strategy of Wallenstein over the warlike instinct of Ferdinand II (Sturdy 2002, p. 56).

5.2.5 The Swedish Intervention in the War: Gustavus II Adolphus and Swedish Politico-Military Projects (1629-34)

The retreat of Denmark from the German lands was supposed to bring peace and end of war in the region: however, this did not take place due to the intervention of Sweden in the politico-religious struggle of central and eastern Europe. Gustavus Adolfphus (1611-1632)–the warrior king of Sweden–was convinced that Sweden needed an expansionist foreign policy to establish its dominance in the European politics. Since 1611, Gustavus had been engaged in profitable wars: in 1617, he acquired the provinces of Karelia and Ingria from Russia by the Treaty of Stolbova. The increasing influence of Sweden became evident in 1629 when Gustavus secured Livonia and the ports of Elbing, Pillau, Memel, and a share of the custom dues of Danzig through the truce of Altmark with Poland. Sweden actually received the right to two-thirds of the all the shipping tolls of the Polish ports of Elbing, Danzig and Duchy of Prussia. It financed the Swedish involvement in the Thirty Years War. Both the army and navy of Gustavus were powerful and efficient. The Swedish king closely watched the advancement of the Habsburg power in Germany and considered it as a possible threat to its commercial and political interests. The religious factor also played a role: Gustavus thought that as a devout Protestant he should extend his

support to the German Protestants. In this critical juncture of history, he was encouraged by France to intervene in the German affairs. France did nothing for the Bohemian rebels; however, the growing political and military influence of the Habsburg Empire created apprehension in France. It was now difficult for France to remain indifferent in the changing international situation. France maintained a safe as well as cautious relationship with Austria in the 1610s. The rise of Cardinal Richelieu in power as the leading minister of Louis XIII (1610-1643) brought anti-Habsburg elements in the French policy. Consequently, there was a shift of the French attitude towards the Austria in the second and third decades of the 17th century.Internally France had already annihilated the Protestants; however, in the foreign affairs, it was eager to ally with the Protestant powers of Europe to stop the Habsburg advancement.It was the logical confluence of both the French and the Swedish interests in the German lands. Both were apprehensive of the growing Habsburg influence in European politics. Richelieu encouraged Sweden to invade Austria in July 1630 (Sturdy 2002, pp. 58-59; Cameron 2001, pp. 211-212).

Gustavus also made diplomatic effort to create a broad anti-Habsburg pro-Protestant alliance incorporating the German princes within his fold. However, it was legally difficult for the princes of the Holy Roman Empire to form any alliance with any outside power. It would be treated as treason against the emperor. In case of Christian IV of Denmark, it was not an issue before the German princes as he was also a German prince. However, Gustavus did not have such claim. He was simply considered as an outsider illegally entering the German lands.Gustavus was eager to be appreciated as a ‘liberator’ of the Protestant lands and not as an ‘invader’. Therefore, he was very cautious in his approach before invading the Habsburg lands. He sent messages to several foreign governments clarifying that his chief aim was not to occupy the country but to rescue the protestants from the Catholic oppression. It was an attempt to legitimize Swedish military movement against the Habsburg Empire. Gustavus imposed an alliance upon the Duke of Pomerania, Bogislaw XIV. He did so because Gustavus had the plan of landing on Peenemünde near Stralsund, which was a territory under Bogislaw. Bogislaw immediately wrote a letter to Ferdinand II expressing his apology to the emperor and clarified that the alliance was imposed on him. He intimated Ferdinand II that he had but no option except to comply with the demands of Gustavus. The Swedish king was also successful in

making treaty with Mecklenburg, Hesse-Kassel and Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel apart from Pomerania. Gustavus was thinking not only of increasing the number of allies but also of the enormous cost of the war with a super power like the Habsburg.In order to solve the financial problem, he extracted large financial donation from the German princes. It met his problem though not fully. The final solution came from France. Cardinal Richelieu–the chief minister of Louis XIII–signed Treaty of Bärwalde on January 23, 1631 with Sweden. The terms of the treaty were as follows:

- Gustavus received the French subsidies at least for next five years.France agreed to pay 400,000 Reichstaler or one million livres per year, with an additional payment of 120,000 Reichstalers for 1630.
- In return, the Swedish force would not attack the members of the Catholic League.
- Protestantism would not be imposed on the predominantly Catholic towns or cities. Gustavus agreed to the grant of religious liberty for the Catholics. (Sturdy 2002, pp. 59-60).

In July 1630, Gustavus landed on Peenemünde. He quickly overran Pomerania and Mecklenburg. Then he moved to the south for Brandenburg in April 1631. However, the sudden and unexpected advancement of Tilly's force and subsequent brutality in the Protestant city of Magdeburg forced Brandenburg to the Swedish camp. In fact, the incidence of Magdeburg in the hands of the Tilly's men represented many symbols: to the Protestants, it was greatest symbols of the Catholic barbarity; to the civilians, it was the pitiless cruelty of vicious and depraved soldiers. The army of Tilly and Gustavus finally met at Breitenfeld on September 17-18, 1631. In this battle, Gustavus heavily defeated the imperial force under Tilly. After this victory, many Protestant princes wanted to make alliance with Gustavus. Gustavus also occupied Würzburg and Frankfurt while the Saxon force captured Prague. Many, especially the Protestants, hoped that the army of Gustavus would now quickly occupy Bohemia, reimpose Frederick V in the throne and restore the Protestant lands which the Commission of Confiscation had sequestered.Nevertheless, Gustavus realized that his army required rest and recuperation. He spent the winter in Mainz.In the Spring of the year 1632, the Swedish forces achieved more stunning victories. Gustavus invaded the Tilly's army once again at Rain near the Danube. The battle

took place between April 14-16, 1632. Tilly was not only defeated but he was seriously wounded, and eventually died. This victory of Gustavus at Rain inaugurated new phase in the Thirty Years War. The Swedish army entered Bavaria, which was a member of the Catholic League. It was a clear violation of the Treaty of Bärwalde. The Swedish army ravaged Bavaria, and entered Munich on May 17, 1632. It was now clear to all that the whole of Germany was under the control of Gustavus Adolphus. It raised new question of political power game in the German lands. Firstly, the rapid victories of the Swedish forces over the imperial army frightened the Protestant princes. They had already started paying the fiscal dues to Gustavus. The princes also apprehended that Sweden would also take a share, may be a part of their territory, as a price during the peace negotiation. Secondly, France was also getting more and more alarmed in the new situation. The fundamental objective of France was to curb down the Habsburg influence in Germany using Sweden. It was not that France wanted the Swedish dominance in Germany instead of Austria (Sturdy 2002, pp. 60-62; Cameron 2001, pp. 212-213).

It was a critical situation for Ferdinand II: on the one hand, Gustavus and his army appeared to be invincible; on the other hand, the death of Tilly and shift of the Protestant princes' loyalty towards Gustavus created a major setback. In this fast-changing situation, Ferdinand had no option but to reappoint Wallenstein, who was once dismissed by Ferdinand himself. Nevertheless, Wallenstein made a hard bargaining with Ferdinand II:

- Wallenstein would be the supreme commander of the army.
- He would recruit and organize a multi-confessional army.
- The emperor would meet the cost of the war.
- Wallenstein would receive more lands and titles in the peace settlement.

The Habsburg power was bound to accept these terms and conditions of Wallenstein. After the finalization of the terms with the emperor, Wallenstein moved swiftly and reoccupied Bohemia from the Saxons. Apprehending the danger, Gustavus attacked the army of Wallenstein at Lützen near Leipzig. Both the Swedish and the Habsburg forces suffered heavy casualties. Wallenstein was defeated by the Swedish forces but Gustavus–the Lion of the North-himself was killed being separated from his main army (Sturdy 2002, pp. 62-63; Cameron 2001, p. 213).

The death of Gustavus did not mean the end of the crisis in the German lands. Gustavus had a left his infant daughter Christina as successor. As Christina was infant, the Swedish Chancellor–Axel Oxenstierna–took the responsibility of administering kingdom. In this situation, both the Habsburg and the Swedish forces started rethinking their position and to gain a conclusive victory; however, neither had the capability to achieve a complete victory. There were other complexities also. The German princes were unwilling to pay 'imperium' to Sweden. On the other hand, Wallenstein–the commander of the Catholic army–secretly made negotiation with the Swedish authority for his personal gain. Ferdinand II issued an order to execute Wallenstein. It was performed on February 25, 1634. Immediately the emperor placed Ferdinand, his son, as the commander of the imperial army. The Protestant princes of Germany viewed Swedish intervention as a problem in the German lands, and not as a solution. Firstly, they had to pay a huge amount of money to Sweden. Secondly, the Swedish army was plundering and devastating the country. John George of Saxony made a proposal to bring peace and stability in the region: his proposal is that Ferdinand II would annul the Edict of Restitution and recognize the fact of military stalemate. In return, the Protestant princes would participate in the peace process. The progress of war in favour of the Habsburg in 1634 created suitable condition for the adoption of John George's proposal. The Swedish army without Gustavus became weak. Spain sent an army of 15,000 to assist Ferdinand II. The Habsburg forces defeated the Swedish army at Nördlingen on September 5, 1634. In this context, the proposal of John George was placed before Ferdinand II. He considered the proposal not simply politically but also religiously and morally as Ferdinand II was an ardent champion of Catholicism and the Edict of Restitution was his plan. He not only took the opinion of his political advisors but also invited views of the leading religious personalities. The collective wisdom worked well. It was advised that Ferdinand could sign in the peace treaty without deviating from his stand as a Catholic emperor. The political consideration also played a major role here. Ferdinand II knew that the prolonged war would delay the election of his sons as the Romans. Consequently, the Peace Treaty of Prague was signed on May 30, 1635 between Ferdinand II and John Georgeafter negotiations with a hope that the peace would be restored in the region (Sturdy 2002, pp. 63-64; Cameron 2001, pp. 213-214).

The Peace Treaty of Prague (1635) was favourable to Ferdinand II's position in many ways.The followings were the main clauses of the Peace Treaty:

- It was resolved in the Peace Treaty that the Edict of Restitution would be suspended (*not abrogated*) for next 40 years.
- As far as the question of church lands was concerned, the determining year was fixed at 1627. It implies that Ferdinand II agreed to return all church lands, which had been seized after 1627 by the Catholics, to the Protestant princes. The fixing of year 1627 was a compromise between both the Catholics and the Protestants. To the Protestants, the year 1627 was better than 1552 but worse than 1618 when the war began. Between 1618 and 1627, the archbishopric and five bishoprics had passed to the Catholic Church. To the Emperor, 1627 was worse than 1552, but better than 1618.
- The emperor also consented that Lutheranism would be recognized in Lower Silesia.
- Calvinism was given no legal recognition and the Calvinists were excluded from the peace process.

The Swedish government was not invited in the peace process. It still remained at war with the Habsburg. Moreover, it was felt that Germany had an immediate requirement of immense material, economic, constitutional and spiritual reconstruction. The major weakness of the Peace Treaty was that it did not include France and Sweden within its scope. In broader sense, it was the expression of German unity under the Habsburg Empire against the foreign intervention. Consequently, the powerful revival of the Habsburg alarmed France, and the French state in this context decided to intervene directly in the Thirty Years War (Sturdy 2002, pp. 63-64; Ingrao 2003, p. 46; Cooper 1971, p. 345). It inaugurated a new phase in the history of this prolonged war.

5.2.6 France, Sweden and the German Wars, 1635-1648

The intervention of France in the Thirty Years War in 1635 needs to be understood in its relationship with Spain. The French power always tried to weaken the Spanish influence in Italy. France also had conflict of interest in the north-eastern frontiers of France and France's northern frontier with the Spanish Netherlands. It

must be remembered in this context that Spain had been the traditional enemy of France and the internal political and religious questions of the Habsburg Empire did not play any dominant role in the formulation of the French foreign policy unless and until there was a possibility of military union between Spain and Austria against France. Richelieu also had the apprehension that if the emperor ensured peace in Germany, Austria might dispose its army for the Spanish assistance. In the summer of 1635, the French army besieged Louvain. The Habsburg Emperor Ferdinand II sent a large army to assist the Spanish force and eventually it contributed to the withdrawal of the French army and gave up the plan of occupying Liuvain. France required a pretext to start the war. It came when Spain arrested Philip Christoph von Sötern–the Elector of Trier and France's ally since 1631. He was handed over to the Habsburg Emperor and was not freed before 1645. Richelieu came to the conclusion that the Habsburg Empire must be kept busy in Germany by instigating a new phase of war. It was possible only through the revival of Franco-Swedish alliance stipulated in the of Treaty of Bärwalde (1631). The Swedish position in Germany also needs to be explained in details here. It is true that Sweden was defeated by Austria in 1634; however, it was not destroyed completely. The war with Austria was undoubtedly a huge burden on the royal coffers of Sweden and the Swedish rulers had the understanding that they must leave the war as soon as possible. However, the Swedes also unanimously held the view that certain preconditions had to be met before the peace was concluded. Firstly, Sweden must be compensated for its sacrifice for the German Protestants. Secondly, Sweden must be allowed to retain its control over the Baltic ports. Thirdly, the Habsburg influence in northern Germany must be curbed down in perpetuity. The Swedish authority concluded that the war must be continued unless and until these demands were met. The dissatisfaction of some of the German princes, for example, Wilhelm V of Hessen-Kassel or the Dukes of Brunswick. There were many nobles, who lost their property to the Catholics, still supported the Swedish power. All these factors created conditions for renewal of Franco-Swedish alliance. Richelieu met Oxenstierna to make the alliance a reality. Oxenstierna was convinced that the revival of the Treaty of Bärwalde was the best way for safeguarding the mutual interest of both France and Sweden. Richelieu also promised the French subsidies to Sweden. He also took another notable step to normalize the Pol-Sweden relationship. Due to his Richelieu's initiative, the truce of Altmark (1629) was

extended via the Treaty of Stuhmsdorf (1635). It freed Sweden from the fear of Polish attack on its Baltic ports. It ensured, consequently, the involvement of Sweden in the German affairs. Being satisfied with the development, Richelieu now started preparation for the war against Spain. On May 19, 1635, Louis XIII declared war on Spain. The entry of France in the Thirty Years War along with its allies made the situation critical (Whaley 2012, pp. 611-612; Sturdy 2002, pp. 66-67).

The first attempt of the Franco-Dutch forces to strike at Italy however failed. The attempt by Bernhard of Saxony-Weimar and Cardinal de la Valette to invade southern Germany also failed completely. On the contrary, the Spanish made significant advancement in northern France and reached up to Amiens in 1636. Dijon was also about to fall before the Spanish army. The second campaign of Bernhard of Weimer brought success to the anti-Habsburg alliances: he was able to capture Alsace as well as Breisach on the Rhine. Both were strategically important. However, although the military capability of Bernhard was unquestionable, as an ally he was not trustworthy. On the one hand, it was difficult for Richelieu to meet the growing financial demands of Bernhard. On the other hand, he wanted always to act as the commander-in-chief of his army, and not under the control of the French crown. Nevertheless, the sudden untimely death of Bernhard on July 11, 1639 changed the situation completely. His army and lands now came under the control of Richelieu. The capture of Alsace cut the Spanish land route to Flanders. Spain faced further set back in October 1639 when the Dutch Admiral Maarten Tromp devasted the Spanish fleet in the Battle of the Downs. It cut the sea route for Spain. It was followed by the revolt of Catalonia (Spring, 1640) and Portugal (December, 1640) against Spain. Catalonia became a French Protectorate in January 1641. The isolated Spanish army was crushed by the French army at Rocroi in 1643. In this context, the north-western expansion of France was inevitable, which frightened the Dutch power. France also captured Dunkirk in 1646. The Dutch authority sought immediate negotiations with Spain because the emergence of an extremely powerful France as neighbour of the Netherlands.It led to the formalization of the independence of the Dutch Republic, the end of the Eighty Years War between Spain and the Dutch rebels. The Peace of Münster in 1648 marked the end of hostility between the Netherlands and Spain. The Spanish force disappeared from the Catholic-Protestant conflict of the German lands. Any chance of help from the Spanish Habsburg to Austria ceased to exist (Whaley 2012, pp. 612-613).

As far as the conflict in the German lands was concerned, the victory of the Franco-Swedish alliances was gradually visible. The Swedish army made remarkable advancement and reached up to Prague in 1639. The also defeated Denmark in 1643-45 and stopped any possibility of the Danish intervention in the Thirty Years War. In southern Germany, the joint Franco-Swedish forces defeated the Habsburg army and occupied most of the major areas during 1645-48.In October 1648, the Swedish force under General Johann Christoph von Königsmarck besieged Prague. They also looted the collections of Rudolph II.The military capability of the Habsburg imperial force was seriously diminished. It was understandable that the Habsburgs would not be able to combat with the joint forces of France and Sweden (Whaley 2012, pp. 614-618; Cameron 2001, pp. 215-217).

5.2.7 Peace of Westphalia (1648)

All the parties involved in this protracted war came to the conclusion that the establishment of peace was the urgent task. The emperor-Ferdinand III, who succeeded his father Ferdinand II on 1637–also realized that it was not possible for the imperial army to defeat France and Sweden. In 1637, Ferdinand III was committed to unite the Reich on Habsburg terms, to expel the foreign forces from the German lands and re-establish military superiority. In 1645, he was, on the contrary, searching for peace at any price.France was also in favour of peace because of the internal disturbances namely Fronde (the revolt of the office-holding nobility in January 1648). The influential Swedish politicians also expressed that the war should be terminated now. After long deliberations and negotiations among the parties between 1643 and 1645, the peace treaty was signed in Münster and Osnabrück. Collectively, it came to be known as the Peace of Westphalia. On October 24, 1648 peace terms were signed simultaneously in Münster and Osnabrück. The Peace of Westphalia concluded the following points:

- The Austrian Habsburg imperial lands remained secured and intact.
- Bohemia was kept under the control of Austria.
- The emperor issued a general armistice to all princes. He also formally repealed the Edict of Restitution. However, the ecclesiastical lands would be restored to the position of 1624, and not 1627, as in the Peace of Prague.

- The religion of each territory would be decided by the religious belief of the ruler. However, it also guaranteed that due to belonging to the different religious practices, no citizen would be deprived of civil rights.
- Much of Pomerania went to Sweden. It also got the ecclesiastical principalities of Bremen and Verden. It helped Sweden to establish its authority in the estuaries ofthe Elbe, Oder, and Weser. Thereafter, Sweden became the leading Baltic power.
- France established much of Alsace. Apart from Alsace, it also got the bishoprics of Metz, Toul and Verdun, and the two fortresses at Breisach and Philippsburg. The aim of France was to secure its north-western frontier as much as possible.
- Brandenburg-Prussia had territorial gain and went ahead of Saxony.
- Calvinism was recognized as an acceptable religion in the Holy Roman Empire.
- The German princes were allowed to determine their own foreign policy.
- France and Sweden were made guarantors of the peace and it provided these two powers the opportunity to intervene in the German affairs in future (Sturdy 2002, pp. 72-74; Cameron 2001, pp. 215-217; Whaley 2012, pp. 619-631).

5.3 Conclusion

Prior to the First World War (1914-1918), any war comparable with the Thirty Years War is difficult to be found. It could even be considered as the first international war. It also caused unparallel loss of life and property. It involved so many powers in the protracted war but not at the same time. It was like a full-scale drama involving innumerable actors and actress entering and departing the theatre hall following their own sequence. This war definitely involved religion. Nevertheless, religion was not the sole issue of the conflict. The political interest played a more important role behind the war. Moreover, the rights and liberties of the German principalities were evoked time and again. At the end of the war, the German princes were allowed to retain their religious and political liberty. The Thirty Years War was also an indication of the beginning of the erosion of Spanish power in the political structure of the 17th century Europe; it also indicated the triumph of France, though it was not obviously absolute. The end of the Dutch-Spanish conflict was also a result

of the war. It is not that after the end of the war, the political map of Europe was fully redefined. However, the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 indicated the beginning of the new era of diplomacy and international politics. France emerged as the major power in western Europe. Prussia appeared to be more influential than Saxony at the end of the war. The Peace of Westphalia ensured peace and stability in Germany at least for next hundred years. The acceptance of Calvinism expressed the recognition of religious toleration in the Holy Roman Empire. It indicated that Europe, though slowly, was trying to move towards a new age – the age of modernity.

5.4 Model Questions

1. What are the factors behind the origin and spread of the Thirty Years War?
2. Review the significance of the Bohemian crisis in the context of the Thirty Years War.
3. Write an essay on the evolution of the Thirty Years War.
4. What was the role of France and Sweden in the Thirty Years War?
5. Discuss the terms and condition of the Peace of Westphalia.
6. What was the significance of the Peace of Westphalia?

5.5 Suggested Readings

Bergin, Joseph (Ed.). *The Seventeenth Century Europe, 1598-1715*. Oxford: OUP, 2008.

Bonney, Richard. *The Short Oxford History of the Modern World. The European Dynastic States. 1494–1660*. Oxford: OUP, 1991.

Cameron, Euan (Ed.). *Early Modern Europe. An Oxford History*. Oxford: OUP, 2001.

Cooper, J. P. (Ed.) *The New Cambridge Modern History. Vol IV. The Decline of Spain and the Thirty Years War, 1609-1648/59*. Cambridge: CUP, 1971.

Ingrao, Charles W. *New Approaches to European History. The Habsburg Monarchy, 1618-1815*. Cambridge: CUP, 2003.

Koenigsberger, H.G. *Early Modern Europe, 1500-1789*. England: Pearson Education Limited, 1987.

Kümin, Beat (Ed.). *The European World, 1500-1800. An Introduction to Early Modern History*. England:Routledge, 2018.

Munck, Thomas. *Seventeenth Century Europe. State, Conflict and the Social Order in Europe, 1598-1700*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Nexon, Daniel H. *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe. Religious Conflict, Dynastic Empires, and International Change*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Parker, Geoffrey. *Europe in Crisis, 1598-1648*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

Sturdy, David J. *Fractured Europe, 1600-1721*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Whaley, Joachim. *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire. Vol. I. From Maximilian I to the Peace of Westphalia, 1493-1648*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.

Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. *Early Modern Europe, 1450-1789*. Cambridge: CUP, 2013.

Winks, Robin W. and Wandel, Lee Palmer. Europe in the Wider World, 1350-1650. New York: OUP, 2003.

Module II: The English Revolution

Unit 6 ❑ Major issues

Structure

6.0 Objectives

6.1 Introduction

6.2 Revolution: Meaning and Concept

6.3 The English Revolution: Historiography

6.4 The English Revolution: Major Issues

6.4.1 The Changing Political Economy and the English Revolution

6.4.2 The Religious Issues of the English Revolution

6.5 Conclusion

6.6 Model Questions

6.7 Suggested Readings

6.0 Objectives

- The present unit aims to understand the issues, especially the major issues, in the Revolution in 17thcenturyEngland.
- The learners will be offered an analysis of the political and economic issues of the Economic Revolution of 17th century.
- This unit will also assess the changing political economy of England and its relationships with the Revolution.
- The religious issues of the English Revolution of 1640 will be analysed and interpreted in detail.

6.1 Introduction

The English Revolution of the 17th century is an outstanding event. It cannot easily be compared with the other revolutions of the contemporary era: for example, the colonial revolts of Ireland, the Netherlands, Catalonia, Portugal and the revolt of Fronde. The 17th century English Revolution put the king on trial in the name of 'the people of England' and on a charge of high treason for violation of 'the fundamental constitutions of this Kingdom'. Lawrence Stone has pointed out that this was something which had never been done before. The king of England had to face the charge that he had violated the fundamental constitution of the Kingdom, which was truly extraordinary.The Revolution of England in the 17th century was also remarkably exceptional due to other reasons (Stone 2017, pp. 53-54):

- It involved the abolition of the monarchy instead of the substitution of one king for another.
- It involved the abolition of the House of Lords instead of execution of persons and confiscation of the property of some of the nobility.
- It involved the confiscation of episcopal property instead of protest against the priests and clergies.
- It involved the abolition of highly important government institutions (administrative and legal) instead of the attack on the officials.

All the above points clearly indicated the degree and extent of the changes caused by the Revolution of 1640 in England. An enormous volume–about 22,000-of pamphlets, newspapers, sermons, speeches were published between 1640 and 1661. It was an indication of the volcanic eruption of debates within the English society regarding the nature of the state, power of the king and the authority of the Parliament. It was expression of the English thinking about the liberty of the people and of society. The question of liberty of the different sections of the society in the perspectives of the authority of crown and state was interpreted, reinterpreted and contested continuously: it was the clash of ideas and ideologies that eventually gave birth to the radical social forces overhauling the family, society, church and state. In this unit, we will try to understand the issues behind these revolutionary transformation in the domain of politics and ideology.

6.2 Revolution: Meaning and Concept

Before going into the details of the English Revolution of 1640, we must delve into the meaning and concept of the word 'revolution'. The word 'Revolution' was initially used in Astronomy: it was used to mean the action by a celestial body of going round in an orbit or elliptical course meant for rotation or the rotation of a celestial body on its axis. In social sciences, it means rapid sweeping transformation of the existing state, power relationship and social structure. Theda Skocpol argues that this rapid and basic transformation of state structure and class relationships are accompanied with two other related coincidences: societal structural change with class upheavals on the one hand and political with social transformation on the other hand. Marx has interpreted revolution as a class-based change: it is an outcome of the structural contradictions, which are historically developed and inherent within the existing social structure (Skocpol 1979, pp. 4-5; Stone 2017, 4-27).

6.3 The English Revolution: Historiography

The English Revolution of 1640 produces a rich historiographical critique of the origin, events and consequences of the entire process. The first critical understanding of the Revolution of 1640 in England has been offered by R. H. Tawney in 1940. Tawney argues that there was a change in the ownership of landed property in England before the civil war: the old propertied class of rural England started decaying and a new gentry class gradually emerged. The traditional landholding class failed to invent a suitable strategy to deal with the problems of estate management, rising prices, agricultural technique and new market channels. Consequently, (i) there was a fall in the manorial holding of the aristocratic class in comparison with the gentry; (ii) there was a shift in the size of the manorial holdings from large to the medium. Both these two consequences were indeed indications of the change in the power structure of the English agrarian society and political relationships at the level of the state. The next interpretation of the English Revolution of 1640 has been offered by Lawrence Stone in 1948. Stone argues that there was a decline of the traditional landed aristocracy in England before the Revolution as suggested by

Tawney; nevertheless, it was due to the inefficient management of the estates. The real reason lies in the over-expenditure of the nobility. It caused the indebtedness of the landed aristocracy and finally decline. In 1953, Trevor-Roper argues that it was not the fall of the traditional landed aristocracy but the decline of the 'mere gentry' that created crisis in the English society in the 17th century England. The fundamental causes of the decline of the gentry were the inflation and the lack of alternative source of income. Trevor-Roper further reminds us that it was not that the English gentry experienced a general decline in the 17th century; there were two types of gentries: 'court gentry' and 'country gentry'. It was the country gentry who experienced the decline. The court gentry, on the contrary, was however able not only to maintain the existing standard of living but also to increase their economic prosperity. The maintenance of the economic prosperity by the court gentry was possible due to their proximity with the kings and their involvement in trade and practice of law. The revolt against the king was made by the country gentry, who experienced the decline, and not the prosperous gentry. This 'mere gentry', according to Trevor-Roper, overthrew the court system, defeated the king and emerged as the radical leaders of the 'New Model Army'. The country gentry wanted decentralization of the government administration, reduction of the costs of litigation, elimination of the courts, and end of monopoly in the economic affairs (Stone 2017, pp. 28-31).

The argument of Trevor-Rover is, however, not above criticism. The historians like J.E.C. Hill and P. Zagorin raise a number of weak areas in the argument of Trevor-Roper in 1958-59. Even according to them, there are absence of links within the argument of Trevor-Roper. These weak areas are the equation of 'mere gentry' with small gentry and the small gentry with the declining gentry, fall of profit from the agriculture in the age of inflation, the identification of court gentry with economic prosperity, the identification of Independents with the mere gentry, the characterization of the policy of Independents as one of decentralization, and so and so forth. During the same period, J. H.Hexteroffers a criticism of Trevor-Roper. He finds a synthesis of Marxist interpretation of History and Lewis Namier's ideas in Trevor-Roper's thesis. On the one hand, Trevor-Roper makes an effort to fit the causal origin of the English civil war in the Marxist theory of the decline of feudalism and the rise of bourgeoisie. On the other hand, he also views the Revolution of 1640 as a conflict between the court gentry and country gentry. Hexter rejects the Lawrence Stone's

idea that there was a general decay of the economic prosperity of the landed aristocracy. However, he is of opinion that the landed aristocracy lost its military dominance over the gentry. It implies that there was shift of the political power from the House of Lords to the House of Commons; nevertheless, the immediate cause of the English civil war was the traditional religious issues and contemporary constitutional factors (Stone 2017, p. 31).

In 1965, Lawrence Stone published his new researches, where he revised his earlier position. On the basis of new data, he came to the conclusion that there was a decline of the landed aristocracy in terms of economic prosperity and military control during the reign of Elizabeth. However, in the early 17th century, due to buoyant land revenue and lavish royal favours, it sharpened the contradiction between the traditional landed magnets and the gentry. This mounting social contradiction between the two most influential classes of the English society in the early decades of the 17th century created enormous pressure on the royal authority. It was impossible for the king to take an independent neutral stand keeping equal distance both from the landed aristocracy and gentry. This imbalance caused the social and political upheaval in the 17th century England (Stone 2017, pp. 31-32). It is transpired from the trends of more recent researches that there were multilayers of tensions and paradigm shift in the 17th century England. Firstly, there was a growing conflict between the gentry and the royal power. Secondly, there was religious conflict between the Puritans and the Anglicans. Consequently, two broad changes emerged in England in the 17th century. On the one hand, there was a shift of power, prestige and property from the landed aristocracy to the gentry. It was not possible for the royal authority to stop this social process. The rise of gentry ensured deep changes in the power structure of England. The emerging gentry organized its power locally, regionally and also nationally to counter the power of the king: the political, religious and financial policies of king were resisted vigorously. On the other hand, the London centric traders began to offer challenge to the monopolistic trading interest of commercial oligarchy (Stone 2017, pp. 32-33). These shift of power–both in the agrarian structure and in the urban commercial sphere–in the 17th century England was the sole cause of the crisis of the contemporary English political economy.

6.4 The English Revolution: Major Issues

The major issues of the English Revolution of 1642 were related to political economy, religion and constitution. However, these three domains were not isolated with each other; rather, these were overlapping with each other and acted in a comprehensive manner in the historical context of the 17th century England.Historians like Conrad Russell argue that there was a gradual functional breakdown of the English state in the 17th century. The Stuart kings tried to rectify the major weaknesses of the state structure and economy; nevertheless, they failed. The economic basis of the English monarchy was extremely weak. England lacked a national taxation system, a major source of royal income in country like France. The principal sources of the income of the English king were the ordinary income from the crown lands, feudal dues such as wardship and customs, grants authorized by the Parliament from time to time. The English crown did not have an effective bureaucracy and a standing army. It had to depend on the local elites for collection of taxes and enforcement of laws (Hughes 1988, pp. 14-15).

6.4.1 The Changing Political Economy and the English Revolution

Penelope Corfield points out that the economic policies of the Stuart monarchy were guided–though not very consistently–by three fundamental considerations. Firstly, the English crown stood firmly for maintaining the social stability and existing hierarchy. They were always opposed to the disruptive forces. Secondly, the crown had to adjust with the changing economic scenario of the country. The Stuarts allied itself with the big and dominant commercial interest, which wanted social stability and preservation of status quo. The large business interest was ready to pay for privileges and protection. Thirdly, the immediate financial considerations also played a major role behind the formulation of king's financial strategy. The immediate considerations included chronic indebtedness and king's search for way to curb down the power of the Parliament, especially in the financial matters. The Stuart kings were desperate to find out new avenues of income, which were beyond the control of the Parliament (Russell 1973, pp. 203-204).

The English royal authority always suffered from a chronic financial problem. The rising inflation and demands for war intensified the problem. Some statistical

estimates would help us to understand the situation: in the 16th century, the royal income doubled; however, during the same period, grain prices rose six-fold and the prices of industrial products more than doubled. The general expenditure of the government increased by five folds. The cost of war was another area where the government had to pay extra amount due to inflation. In the 1590s, Elizabeth spent £260,000 per annum for war in Flanders, France and Ireland. In 1625, the government of Charles I estimated £1 Million for war with Spain. If we take it as an exaggerated estimate, the real cost would not go below £500,000. Elizabeth had to sell the crown lands of £650,000 to meet the war with Spain. It was because of the fact that the grant of Parliament met only half of the cost of this war. This sale of crown lands crippled the financial foundation of the royal authority of England in near future. Amidst this financial crunch, the Crown lands were again opted for sale due to war in the 1620s: between 1628 and 1640, an approximate amount of £350,000 was raised either through sales or through mortgages of the Crown lands. These sales and mortgages effectively weakened the Crown's financial strength. In ***The Books of rates were tables of customs duties or of notional values that existed in medieval and early modern England. Notional values were required for the purpose of the ad valorem duties where, in the absence of adequate documentation, actual values could not be determined.***

a desperate attempt to augment the royal income, the Book of Rates (Books of rates were tables of customs duties or of notional values. Notional values were required for the purpose of the ad valorem duties where, in the absence of adequate documentation, actual values could not be determined.) was revised in 1608. It was last revised in 1558. Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury-the newly appointed Lord Treasurer–made the initiative to publish the new Book of Rates in 1608. The duties were imposed on expanded list of commodities and the level of duties was also increased. According to Bates Case (1606) judgment, these impositions were legal. Nevertheless, it was not sanctioned in the Parliament. It raised fierce oppositions in the Parliament, particularly in 1610 and 1614. James I secured some £70,000 in the royal coffers in 1614. During the reign of Charles I, (in the 1630s) due to the increased impositions, half of the royal income of £900,000 came from custom duties (Hughes 1988, pp. 15-16).

Another notable example of the financial and administrative weaknesses of the English state: it was the introduction of custom farming in the early 17th century. Under this system, the royal customs were collected by the syndicate of merchants and courtiers in return for a rent paid to the king. The advantage of this system was that it guaranteed the king's income. However, the negative aspect of the system was that the extra income was appropriated by the syndicate. Moreover, the leading courtiers in many cases appropriated the revenue from the Crown lands. It further reduced the king's income. It also created resentment among those who were deprived of this opportunity and consequently, from additional income. The right of monopoly on the productions of certain commodities like salt, soap, vinegar etc further deprived the Crown of income. The free trade might have augmented the income of state. The sale of offices in England was also controlled by the officers and not the king. It was another financial and administrative weaknesses of the English royal authority. The profit of the sale of offices was appropriated by the government officers and not by the state(Hughes 1988, pp. 16-17). It might be argued that the birth and consolidation of vested interest of courtiers and officers created an impassable bloc in the political economy of the 17th century England and it was not possible for the English Crown to dismantle it.

The English state of the late 16th and early 17th century faced significant changes in the idea of property rights. During this period, the rise of the idea of *absolute* rights of property was an attack on the existing idea of*conditional* rights of property in England. It was one of the major issues of the English Revolution. It was, moreover, closely linked with the spread of market economy in England during the period under review.In the medieval period, the property was considered as conditional– both technically and in principle. Inmedieval England, land was granted to the husbandmen by the landlords for use. The husbandmen occupied their land as copyholders (customary land ownership). In most of the cases, they copyholders were at the mercy of the will of the landlords. However, in some cases the copyholders were able to get a kind of formal status by being copied in the manorial court roll. The historical evidences show that a tiny minority of farmers retained their freehold status in medieval England. Nevertheless, it did not mean the existence of the right of private property. On the contrary, it was the notion of conditional private property, which was prevalent in medieval world. We must remember that medieval world had

economic affairs, but, the social and spiritual context had the dominance over the economic relationships. The foundation of the social and spiritual context of the medieval world was the idea that the land was held as a trust from God, and was to be used only for the purpose of God. The purpose of God implied the common good of the society. It imposed, at least theoretically, critical restrictions on the use of land for individual profit. Moreover, the people were bound to pay taxes demanded by a king, whatever the amount was, because the king was the supreme custodian of the preservation of common good of the society as a representative of God. In other words, the medieval king could demand any amount of tax from his subjects (Yerby 2020, pp. 102-107). It was the foundation of the medieval kingship in Europe. In the 16th and 17th centuries, this notion (conditional property rights and the right of medieval king) faced challenges from those who believed in free trade, market economy and absolute right of private property.

Those, who believed in the free trade and market economy, aimed to establish the right of absolute private property in land and economic relations replacing the conditional right of property of the medieval era. Two distinct but essentially interrelated developments created necessary material conditions for the development of the theory of absolute right of private property. Firstly, there were new opportunities of profit from land and trade; secondly, the 16th century also witnessed the development of lucrative market. Both these two factors encouraged a section of the English people to tap these economic opportunities. The theoretical justification of the changing economy of England was the theory of absolute right of private property and free trade. It might not be irrelevant here to mention that since the 15th century, England witnessed the expansion of both sheep rearing and cloth trade. The people engaged with economic activities like sheep rearing or cloth trade accumulated substantial amount of profit. It was also clear to the enterprising traders that economic and fiscal independence would increase the rate as well as volume of profit. The potentiality of profit was directly proportioned with the degree of economic and financial liberty of the traders and merchants. The growth of trade, expansion of market and birth of economic specialization gradually reoriented the fundamental economic structure of England from subsistence economy to a market-based economy between the 15th century and 17th century.This development was facilitated by another important development in late medieval England. Unlike the

Continental Europe, England did hardly have any internal trade barriers. Except London, there was no semi-autonomous region which could impose custom duties. Consequently, a nationwide integrated market was slowly emerged in England and it was largely untaxed between 1500 and 1700. It also ensured profit from trade. The traders wanted this practical freedom in principle (Yerby 2020, pp. 107-109).

The early Stuart kings failed to understand these deep-seated changes in the political economy of England. The specialization of production, the integration of market, the expansion of trade and accumulation of profit in the 16th and 17th centuries England gave birth to a new class of enterprising people as well as a new theory of free trade and market economy that started legitimizing the changes.The Stuart kings like James I or Charles I belonged to the moral economy of the feudal era, and they made wholehearted effort to protect it. Therefore, it was a clash between two contending eras: declining feudal era and emerging capitalist era.

In the period of emerging capitalist era (the 16th and the 17th centuries), the demand of the freedom of trade was one of the major issues of the English society. Freedom of trade meant freedom from arbitrary impositions of duties by rulers and free movements of commodities from one place to another. In the second half of the 16th century, the freedom of trade became a dominant political discourse in the public sphere of England.It was in complete contradiction with the royal notion of power, which believed in the king's right of imposition of taxes on its subjects and also in the regulation of trade. Consequently, there emerged two competing forces in late 16th and early 17th centuries England: idea of freedom of trade versus royal power of prerogatives and privileges. The expansion of trade, integration of market and accumulation of profit consolidated the financial position of those who believed in free trade. The economic prosperity further made this class confident enough to challenge the political authority of the Stuart kings in the early 17th century (Yerby 2020, pp. 109-113). Nevertheless, the question of freedom of trade was not raised by the traders only: the other classes like the manufacturers, the artisans, the landowners and the farmers also stood for freedom of trade. It became a collective psychology in 17th century England.The right of free trade was assumed to be universal and applicable for all domains of the English economy: it was demanded as the very right of the subjects. The absolute right of the private property was also upheld in this context (Yerby 2020, p. 119).

The English monarchy during the Tudor period rested upon a subtle balance between the Crown and the emerging class forces. The gentry and the merchants represented a support base to the royal authority as long as the monarchy was engaged in weakening feudalism and preserving the class interest of the gentry and the merchants.We have already noted that the Tudor Monarchy had certain inherent weaknesses. It did not have a standing army or a bureaucracy. The amount of revenue was insufficient to meet the cost of the state. The Tudor monarchy was therefore bound to depend on the merchants and a section of the landed gentry to run the administration. It is needless to point out that it was a riskyequilibrium that sustained the integrity of the English monarchy. In the 16th century, the monarchy in England was engaged in the destruction of the medieval military feudalism. The landed gentry, the merchants and the rising middle class were allies of the monarchy in this historical task. As long as the king was engaged in the destruction of feudal remnants and established peace, order and stability in England, these classes extended their support. However, it was impossible for the English monarchy to destroy the feudal structure completely as the monarchy itself was a part of feudalism. The landed gentry, the merchants and the middle class however wanted to destroy the feudalism completely. To the monarchy, it would be a self-destruction. After the destruction of the military feudalism, the emerging social classes like the gentry, the merchants and the middle class, aimed to curb down the power of the monarchy and establish the sovereignty of the Parliament. Therefore, it was essentially a political struggle. The question of the king's right to impose taxes without the consent of the Parliament was the economic expression of this inevitable political struggle between the king and the middle class. While the Stuart kings believed in the Divine Right, the middle class advocated the liberty of the subjects. Therefore, the contradiction between the king and the classes–the gentry, the merchants and the middle class–was irreconcilable. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the king was guided by predetermined theoretical propositions: it was the establishment of the absolute despotism in England. The theoretical propositions of the middle class were however evolving, and not fully crystalized even in 1640s. The English middle class was trying to develop its own political theory to justify the demand of liberty of the subjects and the notion of parliamentarian sovereignty. The entire 17th century witnessed the evolution and articulation of political theory, which would suit to the class interest

of the rising bourgeoisie. The historical fate and the results of the struggle between the king and the bourgeoise were unknown to all in the middle of the 17th century, in other words, it was not possible to imagine the historical development of 1688in the 1640s (Morton 1989, pp. 190-194).

6.4.2 The Religious Issues of the English Revolution

Undoubtedly, the English Revolution of 1640 was a political affair. The origins of the revolutionary transformation were rooted in the crisis of the political economy of the 16th and 17th centuries England. Consequently, it initiated changes in the political sphere of early modern England: the most fundamental feature of the change was the recognition of liberty of the individuals. In this context, we must remember that in any medieval and early modern society, religion was an inseparable part of the politics and society, and England was no exception. Therefore, it would be erroneous to interpret the revolutionary transformation of England in the 17th century as a pure political affair. The religious issues played a significant role in the development of English politics as an inseparable part. Religion was not an isolated domain and a separate entity form politics and society. On the contrary, religion may be viewed as the binding ideology of a pre-modern society like England. Moreover, the institutional expression of religion–the binding ideology of the early modern English society–was church. The church because of its special position in the society controlled almost all the aspects of life of the common people. Indeed, the church had an unparallel dominance over the society in medieval and early modern era. Few examples will illustrate the all-pervading presence of the church in the 16th and 17th century England's daily life: Sunday prayer was compulsory and the failing of which was unlawful; the people had to pay compulsory tithe to the church; the church had courts to which the people were, at least theoretically, liable; the parish was the social unit in rural England with its own officers exercising effective control over the village population. Apart from the administrative activities, the church had virtual control over the education system of 17th century England. Education was an ecclesiastical monopoly. The bishops enjoyed the authority to censure any book. Unless and until licensed by a bishop, no one was allowed to teach in a school or even privately. Finally, the Bible was considered to be a holy solution of all the problems of life (Hill 1980, pp. 74-76). In other words, all most all the aspects of the life in medieval and

early modern England were under the supervision of Christianity and Christian church. It was unprecedented domination of religion on society, which is difficult to be imagined in the modern era.

The state was also aware of the significance of the church in the keeping the society both intact and obedient. Religion was considered to be a part of the state politics. The king, the nobility and the bishops represented the common interest. To be precise, it was a patron-client relationship that created bonding among the royal authority, the nobility and the churchmen in the early modern England. Therefore, it can be easily argued that there was no question of democracy within the English church during the period under review. Bishops were also civil servants and state administrators. The High Commission, the supreme power in the Church, was as much an organ of the royal bureaucracy as the Star Chamber. Censorship was used not only for the religious purposes but also for the political purposes. The state and church collectively used excommunication as a tool to suppress the nonconformist voices (Hill 1980, pp. 76-79).

Puritanism emerged as a socio-religious force against this king-nobility-bishop nexus in early modern England. It raised new questions about the legitimacy of the existing religious practices in England. It supplied a collective morale to those who did not believe in the power and authority emerged from the above-mentioned politico-religious nexus.The Puritans believed in three fundamental elements: preaching, discipline and Sabbatarianism. Puritanism emphasized on the intellectual aspects of the religious practices against the liturgical and sacramental one. Preaching was part of the struggle of the Puritans against the liturgical and sacramental practices. The emphasis on the notion of discipline was a part of the religious and socio-economic life of the those who believed in the hard work for prosperity. This doctrinal aspect of Puritanism had significant appeal to the small and medium employers, traders and merchants. It would not be irrelevant to mention that Puritanism was strongly visible in commercially prosperous regions like London, Home Counties, East Anglia and other clothing areas. The urban propertied class found hard work through discipline as a way to improve the standard of living and to serve God. Puritan Sabbatarianism was the third important element of the changing religious practices. It argued that the saints' day should no longer be holidays. In medieval England, (also in the other Catholic countries) in the 17th

century, the year was marked out by over a hundred holy days, on which no work was done. The Puritans in England opposed this idea and pointed out that regular weekly rest day was appropriate for a commercial economy (Hill 1980, pp. 79-84). It was a new development in the 16th and the 17th centuries England: religious practices were reinterpreted and reassessed in the light of the changing structure of economy–from a closed feudal one to open bourgeois one.

During the same period, another problem cropped up in the domain of religion. It was associated with the poor economic condition of the clergy in general in England. The rising prices pushed the majority of the clergy towards poverty line. A section of the higher clergy or bishops were however able to maintain and even increase their economic condition. The growing inequality among the clergies became a grave concern in the English society. In 1610, Archbishop Bancroft suggested that all tithes were to be paid in kind; the powers of the ecclesiastical courts should be augmented especially in cases of the tithes; all exemptions from the tithes should be abolished; mortuaries (death duties to church) and other fees to the church needed to be revived. Moreover, 3,849 parishes (over forty per cent) were 'impropriated', that is, the right to tithes and patronage was held by laymen. Bancroft wanted a fund to be raised, by Parliamentary taxation, to buy out these laymen, and the right of presentation to be given to Bishops. If this was not possible, Bishops should be authorised to compel impropriators to increase payments to vicars. This plan could have solved the economic crisis to some extent, if it had been implemented. However, it was dropped because of the fact that it would have deprived the nearly 4000 impropriators and all the property owners of England. The demand for the abolition of pluralism (the holding of several livings by one cleric) was raised on many occasions as it intensified the economic inequality within the clergy. The worst pluralists were the bishops and the cathedral, university, and court clergy. It became almost a class war between the 'court' and the 'country' within the church. It was demanded by the dissenters that the landed property of the higher clergy should be confiscated and used to solve the king's financial crisis. The Puritans wanted the abolition of pluralism. They were also eager to use the revenues of bishops and other higher clergies to organize preaching in every parish. The schools could be established and endow relief might be organized. As there was no organized attempt to address the issue of poverty of the ministers, the Puritans made effort to collect money to

alleviate the poverty of the lower clergies. However, this effort was considered as a challenge to the authority, and was crushed immediately. The high clergy was also in favour of personal monarchy (Hill 1980, pp. 84-90). It is clear from this analysis that England witnessed growing religious cleavages between the bishops and higher clergy on the one hand and lower clergy on the other hand. The economic inequality fuelled the differences of religious issues between them. The bishops in early modern England stood in favour of the preservation of the authority of the king and high priests along with the privileges and economic prosperity. They were supported by the 'court'. This group was opposed by the Puritans, who wanted democratization of the church structure and church property, who demanded the more equitable distribution of income and who wanted preaching in every parish of England. Like the political and economic issues, the socio-religious issues were also irreconcilable in 16th and 17th centuries England. Even it is difficult to single out the religious issues from political one: both were intertwined with each other and represented a complex development of the history of England.

6.5 Conclusion

In the late 16th century and early 17th century England, the question of the absolute right of private property was defended especially in the domain of trade. Precisely speaking, the question of absolute right of property was considered by the Englishmen in the broader perspectives of general structure of economy and right of the citizens. It was the beginning of certain fundamental changes in the political economy of England in the 16th and the 17th centuries: it underwent a transformation from a feudal political economy dominated by prerogatives and privileges to a capitalist political economy based on the notion of free trade, competition, market opportunities and competence. England signalled a transition from a *closed moral economy* (obviously in relative sense of the term) to an*open market economy* in the late Tudor and early Stuart era. The 17th century English Revolution was the political and intellectual expression of this transition. The major issues discussed here are related to this broad revolutionary transformation towards a market-based commercial economy. The political perspective of the English Revolution was the struggle to establish the right of the Parliament in place of the Divine Right of the king. To be

more precise, it was a move towards a bourgeois supremacy in the economy, society and politics of the 17th century England from a predominantly feudal structure of the previous centuries.

6.6 Model Questions

1. Discuss the historiographical aspects of the English Revolution of 1640.
2. What were the major issues of the English Revolution of the 17th century?
3. How did the economic condition of England contribute to the Revolution in the 17th century?
4. Do you think that the changing political economy of the 17th century played a major role in the revolutionary transformation of England?
5. How do you assess the importance of the religious issues in the Revolution of England in the 17th century?

6.7 Suggested Readings

Cameron, Euan (Ed.). *Early Modern Europe. An Oxford History*. Oxford: OUP, 2001.

Cressy, David. *England on Edge. Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.

Hill, Christopher. *The English Revolution 1640 An Essay*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1955.

Hill, Christopher. *Reformation to Industrial Revolution. The Making of Modern English Society, Vol I, 1530-1780*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.

Hill, Christopher. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. London: Routledge, 1980.

Hughes, Ann. The Causes of the English Civil War. Great Britain: Macmillan, 1988.

Kennedy, D. E.*The English Revolution, 1642-1649*. Great Britain: Macmillan, 2000.

Koenigsberger, H.G. *Early Modern Europe, 1500 – 1789*. England: Pearson Education Limited, 1987.

Morton, A. L. *A People's History of England*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1989.

Pennington, D, H. *Europe in the Seventeenth Century*. England: Longman, 1989.

Russell, Conrad (Ed.). *The Origins of the English Civil War*. England: Macmillan, 1973.

Skocpol. Theda. *States and Social Revolution. A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. Cambridge: CUP, 1979.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-1642*. Oxford, Routledge, 2017.

Sturdy, David J. *Fractured Europe, 1600-1721*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E. *Early Modern Europe, 1450-1789*. Cambridge: CUP, 2013.

Yerby, George. *The Economic Causes of the English Civil War. Freedom of Trade and the English Revolution*. New York: Routledge, 2020.

Unit 7 ❑ Fermentation of Ideas: Political and Intellectual currents

Structure

7.0 Objectives

7.1 Introduction

7.2 The Peculiarities of the English Social and Political Context

7.3 The Merchant–Gentry Alliance: The Road to Revolution

7.4 The Long Parliament

7.5 The First Civil War: The King, Parliament and the Army, 1642-1646

7.6 Interregnum

7.7 The Second Civil War, Revolution and Regicide, 1648-1649

7.8 Conclusion

7.9 Model Questions

7.10 Suggested Readings

7.0 Objectives

- The fundamental objective of the present unit is to understand the evolution of the political and intellectual currents of the English Revolution.
- It deals with the basic question of English exceptionalism.
- The following major development would also be discussed: the merchant-gentry alliance, the Long Parliament, the first civil war, the interregnum and the second civil war in detail.
- The learners will eventually get a comprehensive understanding of the deep-rooted changes of the English politics and society during this period.

7.1 Introduction

In the earlier units, we have already discussed the major issues–political, social and religious–of the 17th century English Revolution. It is now evident to us that the English society underwent socio-economic, political and religious transformation during this period. In one sentence, it was a search of the dominant sections of the English society transformation from a closed structure to an open one. In other words, a section of the English society struggled to establish an open society in the 17th century England. It was open in the sense that it would not only include economic freedom but also political and religious liberty of the Englishmen. The 17th century English bourgeoisie questioned the authority of the king to impose taxes arbitrarily and without the consent of the Parliament. The king always considered it as a right and he was not supposed to take consent from the Parliament. In this sense, as some historians suggest, it was a struggle between the 'court' ('court' implies the king and his people who believed in privileges and prerogatives) and the 'country' ('country' means the people who wanted to destroy the privileges and prerogatives of the king and his people and to establish the sovereignty of the Parliament). This contradiction of the English society evolved over the years and turned to a revolutionary situation in the 17th century. A close look of the fermentation of the political and intellectual ideas would reveal the evolution of the revolutionary process and associated changes that transformed England in the 17th century. In this unit, we will concentrate on this particular issue: how political and intellectual ideas germinated, evolved and influenced the course of history of 17th century England.

7.2 The Peculiarities of the English Social and Political Context

The early modern England's social and political context was exceptionally different from contemporary European society and politics. This peculiarity gave birth to the distinct political and intellectual currents in England. Let us analyse the peculiarities of the English social and political context in the 16th and the 17th centuries.

In England, a major section of the propertied class was engaged in trade of cloth, wool and agricultural commodities during the period under review. It was a lucrative source of income and profit to them. In contemporary France, it was unbelievable for a noble to get involved in such economic activities. The French society was divided into privileged and non-privileged, and all the social classes except the clergy and nobility belonged to the Third Estate. In England, it was a confrontation between the 'court' and the 'country'. The 'court' offered privileges to the monopolists; the 'country' believed in the free trade and liberty. Therefore, it was more of an economic contradiction than a social one. On the contrary, in early modern France, the division was more a social rather than economic one.The propertied class in England during the 16th and 17th centuries aimed (it must be remembered that the English bourgeoisie evolved gradually over the years and therefore, its ideology and class structure took time to get shaped) to establish a parliamentary system of governance where everything would be debated and discussed before the final policy making and the king must not have any exclusive power to impose taxes on the citizens without the consent of the parliament. Both the Tudor and the Stuart Governments were financially and administratively weak. The landed propertied class had already become powerful enough in the English rural society, and they had control over wages and poor relief as Justices of the Peace. They enjoyed virtually independent power over the masses, and the royal government had nothing to do with it. It was not possible for the Stuart Government to regulate the socio-economic life of rural England in a centralized manner. One estimatereveals the social capability of the merchants and the gentry in English society. In ten counties, they voluntarily contributed £500,000 between 1601 and 1630 for poor relief. They had enormous dominance over the masses as the merchants and the gentry controlled and regulated the scheme. They endowed the schools, provided scholarships and assisted the apprentices, and it was through all these steps a kind of society was developed in early modern England, which believed in efficiency and competitive aptitude instead of birth right. Talent became the primary capital of the aspirant section of the masses and not the inherited privileges (Hill 1980, pp. 100-102).

The royal authority failed to understand the degree and extent of the changes in the English social life. The king and his associates, on the contrary, tried to protect the monopolists, neglected the interest of the free traders, cornered the Puritans and

reduced the importance of the Parliament. Nevertheless, the Stuart kings failed to implement their policy. The peculiarity of the social and political context of early modern England made it difficult to establish the absolute power of the king over the society and politics. The merchants and the gentry were already powerful enough to challenge the royal prerogative, privileges and notion of divine rights in all aspects of the policy formulation and decision-making. Therefore, it was definitely an economic conflict but more than an economic one. It was a contradiction between two opposite ideas, ideology and worldview. It was a confrontation between the two diametrically opposite ages: feudalism and capitalism.

7.3 The Merchant–Gentry Alliance: The Road to Revolution

The Stuart kings faced the most formidable challenge from the alliance of the merchants and the gentries in England during the period under review. It is already noted that the both the king and the merchant-gentry represented two different worldviews: monopoly versus free trade; king's divine privileges versus right of parliament; restrictions imposed by the state versus the liberty of people and so on and so forth. By 1610, the merchant-gentry alliance had consolidated its social and political position to such an extent that it could now challenge the king's authority in the Parliament. This newly acquired strength of the two emerging social classes of early modern England–merchants and gentry–came to be reflected in the debates against the king's arbitrary rights and in favour of liberty of the citizens in Parliament during period.

In the great constitutional debate of 1610, the issues of freedom of trade and absolute right of property were raised, deliberated and vehemently debated. Indeed, this was the first time, the idea of absolute property was advanced in the parliament to a significant extent. This explicit advancement of the absolute property right's notion created full-flagged confrontation between those who believed in the representative rights and those who advocated the king's prerogative. It was for the first time in the history of England the discretionary powers of the Crown were formidably challenged by the House of Commons on the basis a general right of consent. Two factors–distinct but interrelated–played the critical role in articulating

the demands of the gentry and the merchants. Firstly, it was the notion of the right of the freedom of trade; secondly, it was the idea of the representative concept. Both were intertwined with each other. The rising bourgeoisie–gentry and merchants–promoted this idea of freedom of trade and liberty of representatives in the parliament. The rationale behind this idea was to have an economic environment without arbitrary royal duties and exactions. It generated a coordinated challenge to the notion of royal prerogative (Yerby 2020, pp. 122-123).

In 1610, the notion of the right of freedom of trade was heavily contested and debated in the Parliament. The House of Commons was determined to protect the right of freedom of trade as it was associated also with the right of the parliament as far as the imposition of taxes was concerned. The debate of 1610 was initiated in 1606 when John Bate–a London merchant–refused to pay the taxes imposed on imported currants. He was supported by many traders who opposed the arbitrary royal impositions. This collective voices of the traders against royal impositions without the consent of the parliament was the expression of the demand of the freedom of trade. The House of Commons sharply opposed the monopolistic rights and king's arbitrary imposition of taxes. However, there was opposition to the those who championed the idea of freedom of trade in the parliament. The royal apologists in the House stood for royal prerogative. They drew strength from the constitutional convention. However, it was not an easy task before the royalists to assert the right of the king in the name of the convention. The member like Sir Nicholas Fuller (1543-1620) was determined to curb down the king's arbitrary power and to establish the power of the parliament over king. The freedom of trade became the most radical issue in early 17th century England, and it was felt that it could not be reconciled within the existing structure. It was thelong-term dynamics in the history of conflict between the king and the parliament in early 17th century. The issues were persistence and contentious, and therefore the House of Commons was determined to raise the issue of freedom of trade in the parliament. The king referred the matter to the Court of Exchequer. The Court was of opinion that the king had every right to impose customs by prerogative.Thomas Fleming (1544-1613)–the Chief Baron of the Exchequer since 1604–argued that as king was the guardian of the general public good, therefore, he enjoyed this prerogative power. Moreover, the king also required this power because it also involved relationships with the foreign countries. As this

argument seemed to be very sound and rational, the supporters of the freedom of trade had nothing to point out in favour of their viewpoint. However, the question of imposition still continued in the Commons' list of grievances. When in 1606 it was finally presented, the king argued that the issue had already been endorsed by the law lords, and therefore, there was no need to say on it. Robert Cecil (1563-1612)–the Lord High Treasurer–appropriated the opportunity of this situation and imposed taxes on wide range of commodities systematically and extensively. Fleming argued that the royal prerogative was reflection of the Crown's absolute power and it was beyond the jurisdiction of the House of Commons to deliberate on it. It was a sharp blow to the free trader's lobby. The members of the House of Commons were however determined to challenge the notion of king's absolute power and to establish the freedom of trade (Yerby 2020, pp. 123-125). The uncompromising stand of the both sides made the conflict inevitable.

In May 1610, the issue was raised in the parliamentary session by Sir Edwin Sandys (1561-1629). The position of the king was already clear: the issue of king's prerogative right of impositions could not be questioned. On May 21, 1610 James came in person to clear his position and tried to address the grievances of the members. He reiterated that it was not lawful for the members of the House of Commons to raise question about the king's authority. The English kings always possessed this power of royal prerogatives: it is true that the kings occasionally made temporary concessions to the traders by waiving impositions in certain respects; nevertheless, it was not the right of the members of the parliament to ask a king to waive imposition because it would, in this case, openly challenge the royal authority.James pointed out that the House of Commons could not raise any question about the right and power of the king in general; instead,what it could do to draw the attention of the king for a particular issue. It was also pointed out by James that he would consult with the members of the House of Commons regarding the impositions, but it did not mean that the English king was bound to accept the advices of the Commons. This royal position on the question of power and authority of the English Crown was unacceptable to the members of the House of Commons. The members of the House of Commons, who were actually reflecting the popular assumption regarding the king's prerogative power, believed that king was bound to exercise his power through parliament only. James Whitelocke(1570-1632) opposed

the king's view on the basis of two fundamental points of the idea of liberty: firstly, the property of the citizens could not be taken away without his consent; secondly, no law could be made without the consent of the parliament. The first principle actually existed in England in land, and the members of the House of Commons wanted to extend it to the domain of trade. The second principle was also nothing new because in England no law would be legislated without the consent of the parliament. It was reiterated by the members of the parliament that the 'edit of a king was not a law'. The sovereign position of parliament was established in England in the decade of 1530s through the break with the Rome. Henry VIII and his minister Thomas Cromwell believed that the moral authority of the Church of the Christendom could only be displaced by the moral force of the parliament. It established the sovereignty of the parliament. In 1610, the members of the House of Commons made an advancement by redefining and reinterpreting their private or local interests as a collective, national interests. It was a new age in the history of England: the freedom of trade became an issue of public good on the one hand and establishment of sovereignty of parliament over the king's prerogative right (Yerby 2020, pp. 125-129).

The situation would have been developed in a different course if the king had not allowed the further debate in House of Commons. The members of the House of Commons urged that their intention was not to raise dispute over the question of king's power, but wanted to understand the very foundation of it. This appeal was allowed. Nevertheless, it was a self-defeating decision of James as he was of opinion that the king's power stood over parliament. James was bound to do it because of his financial weaknesses. At the end of June and the beginning of July, 1610 the debate on the king's prerogative authority of impositions took place in parliament. The question was very clear: did the king have the right of arbitrary impositions? The answer was obvious to all without any doubt: the king had the power. However, the strong will of the House of Commons sharply contradicted the force of law. The majority of the MPs aimed to bring the question of impositions within the representative consent of parliament. It must be noted that the law was not in favour of the will of the MPs. But it was actually the growth of the political power of the House of Commons indicating the shifting balance of the English society from the royal prerogative to parliamentary authority.Nicholas Fuller was the first speaker on behalf

of the parliament. He clearly pointed out that the no part of the property of a subject could not be taken away without his consent and the law could not also be made without the approval of the parliament. It implied that the king did not have any arbitrary power as far as the imposition of taxes was concerned. James Whitelocke, another member of the House of Commons supported Fuller's position that the king had no power to take away the property of the subjects without their consent. Both Fuller and Whitelocke argued that the king could not legislate by patent. Whitelocke advanced this argument to a new level by pointing out that the king operated his power at two levels: the first level of power was exercised by king's own authority; the second level was however exercised within the jurisdiction of parliament, and it was only in the parliament that the king could enact law as sovereign authority, therefore, the second level of power was superior than the first level of power. This argument actually established sovereign power of the parliament, and all the affairs of the state including the financial one was under the representative consent of the parliament (Yerby 2020, pp. 130-134).

The strong will of the members of the parliament in favour of freedom of trade and representative consent were reflections of a new class balance in17th century England. It was the merchant-gentry alliance that completely transformed the political equilibrium and it was difficult for the English king to cope with it. The majority of the members of the House of Commons belonged to the gentry class. It was an exceptional development by which the emerging gentries became dominant in the English political system. The merchants were beneficiaries of this change. It should not be forgotten that a sizable section of the gentries was involved in commercial transactions, and the aims of both the gentries and the merchants were almost identical. A close interest in trade was a distinctive pre-occupation of the Elizabethan and early Stuart gentry in general. Moreover, the gentry forged a crucial link between the farming practices and the market incentives. In many cases, the difference between the gentries and the merchants was getting blurred. It was a new social formation in 17th century England which radicalized the question of sovereignty of the parliament. The House of Commons increasingly supported the demand of the free trade. In 1610 and 1620s, the merchants of Dartmouth and Plymouth raised the issue of free trade respectively and it came to be supported by the House of Commons. The merchants of Plymouth sought legislation to waive the monopoly

imposed on Newfoundland Cod fishing. It was obvious that the bill had no chance of royal approval. However, in 1624, the House of Commons unilaterally declared the free trade in this area and invalidated the monopoly right. The towns in England emerged as not only centres of trade but also centres of movement against monopoly. The town merchants were the champions of the demand of freedom of trade unequivocally. The House of Commons formalized this demand and provided the constitutional base to it (Yerby 2020, pp. 135-141).

The royalists also made efforts to counter the House of Commons' stand in relation to the question of freedom of trade. The Bishop of Lincoln in the House of Lords stated that it was seditious to raise any question about the royal prerogative. James saw the attitude of the House of Commons as subversive. The difference between the royalists and the House of Commonswidened. John Chamberlain bracketed the monopolists and impositions with each other. William Nyell of Dartmouth–a prominent free trader–raised his voice against the pretermitted custom duties on cloth, which were levied with the consent of the parliament. Thomas Wentworth argued that the imposition was the sole factor behind the decay of trade and commerce. John Delbridge and Edward Alford expressed similar views. Sir Edward Coke pointed out that the Low Countries became prosperous because of the absence of imposition. In 1624, the session of the parliament was busy with the foreign policy of James I. The House of Commons persuaded King James to abandon his pro-Spanish policy. The issue of free trade did not appear in surface; nevertheless, the James knew that the issue had not gone away. Moreover, he was determined to assert his prerogative right. It is obvious that the House of Commons was also equally resolute to undermine the king's prerogative right and uphold the position of the parliament (Yerby 2020, pp. 141-145).

In 1625, Charles I succeeded James I. The merchant-gentry alliance in the House of Commons was now more subtle in pursuing the issue of the free trade in its favour. Charles I expected that the parliament following the traditional convention would grant the tonnage and poundage to the king for lifetime. The English kings since Henry V (1386-1422) had been enjoying this right. However, in the tensed situation the House of Commons was determined to exploit the situation in its favour. The Commons affirmed that unless and until the satisfactory resolution had been

received from the king in the matter of royal prerogative, the confirmation of tonnage and poundage would be given for one year only.Sir Robert Phelipsdemanded that the king must not use this act for imposing taxes against the free traders. During the period of Charles I, the House of Commons was determined to curb down the king's prerogative power. The issue was elaborately discussed in the committee of the whole House on July 5, 1625. The MPs concluded that the parliament itself should assume the responsibility of composing the book of rates relieving the royal officers from this task. Nevertheless, despite the high the determination of the MPs, the existing reality did not allow the parliament to fix everything within a short period. Moreover, the king was not ready to give up his authority. Consequently, the king was able to retain his authority on tonnage and poundage and at the same time the questions raised by the parliament remained unresolved. In 1626, Sir Nathaniel Richassured Charles that "the subject would keep up his revenues according to the book of rates" if the king "would undertake that he be quieted from further impositions". However, the king did not show any inclination to give up his prerogative right. The MPs again in 1628 reiterated their view that imposition is illegal and the system of prerogative custom dues should be ended. The leaders like Sir Edward Coke and Sir Nathaniel Rich argued that the parliament would grant tonnage and poundage if the king surrendered his right of imposition and allowed them to compile the book of rates. Nevertheless, Charles' position was consistent and he wanted that the tradition should be maintained in the grant of tonnage and poundage. In 1629, the parliament was called to resolve the dispute by granting the tonnage and poundage to the king. Charles urged to the members of the House of Commons that it was a necessity and not supposed to be a right. It indicates that Charles wanted a compromise with the parliament as far as the grant of the tonnage and poundage was concerned. The implication was that if the Commons would pass the bill as it had been done for his predecessors, he would acknowledge that he raised tonnage and poundage by right of this grant, and not by prerogative. However, the king's proposal had no appeal to the members of the House of Commons.The 1629 parliament was finally terminated without any conclusive decision (Yerby 2020, pp. 146-150).

The king, thereafter, decided to govern England without taking Parliament into his confidence. Charles failed to pursue the House of Commons to grant the right of

tonnage and poundage. The MPs were also determined to abolish the king's right to impose arbitrary taxes (Yerby 2020, p. 150).

7.4 The Long Parliament

The parliament once again met in April 1640. It was noticed that both the king and members of the parliament were firm on their position. There was no change of opinion between 1629 and 1640. The king believed in the right of imposition; the House of Commons on the contrary believed in the right of the parliament. Therefore, it is needless to point out that the parliament in 1640 began with a stalemate. The king wanted money immediately for his war with the Scots while the parliament was determined to establish its rights. The parliament was willing to grant money to the king if the king would recognize the right of the parliament. The members of the parliament also raised question about the long intermission of the parliament, and it was termed as 'the grievance of the grievances.' Charles immediately dissolved the parliament in May 1640 in orderto avoid this type of criticism.In history, this parliament is known as Short Parliament. The dissolution of the parliament, however, further weakened his position. His weak army was overwhelmed by the Scots in the August 1640 in the Second Bishop's War. Completely demoralized and humiliated, Charles had no other option but to recall the parliament. This session of the parliament came to be known as the Long Parliament. The major significance of the Long Parliament is that during this period no political and military plan of Charles was tenable without the support of the parliament. It was for the first time in the history of England that the parliament was on the command of the situation and course of history. On November 3, 1640 the parliament was recalled (Yerby 2020, pp. 231-235).

The members of the parliament realized that their consistent struggle for establishing the right of the parliament was now on the verge of the fulfilment. They seized the chance without any hesitation and took measures to uplift the position of parliament over the king's prerogative power and to establish representative consent in the national affairs. In order to achieve this objective, the Long Parliament introduced the Triennial Act in February of 1641. It was stipulated in the Triennial Act that the summoning of the parliament would no longer depend on the king's

wish. It provided instead that parliament would assemble automatically, according to the new law, if the king had failed to call it after a three-year period.The Triennial Act of 1641 was a direct attack on the king's age-old prerogative rights. It also gave the parliament an independent and permanent existence at the centre of the English political life. In this sense, it was really a revolutionary measure. It permanently curbed down the king's power and established the authority of the parliament. In other words, the political balance of the 17th century England was changed in favour of the parliament as a result of the introduction of this act (Yerby 2020, pp. 235-237).

The Triennial Act was a radical measure in form and intention as it was able to establish the interest of the masses over the interest of the king. Charles saw the bill as an attempt to override his constitutional authority, and it was therefore not acceptable to him.The members of the House of Commons considered the bill as non-negotiable. Charles fell into deep crisis. If he did not consent to the bill, he faced complete disaster and humiliation in respect of his position in the north. A parliamentary subsidy was the only thing that could provide the financial security against which the king's military needs and obligations could be met, and the Commons were making their cooperation dependent on his acceptance of the triennial bill. The king had nothing to do but to accept the bill. This act fundamentally altered the balance of power between the king and the parliament and started exerting critical influence on the power and authority of the king. The Triennial Act enabled the parliament to employ a systematic and continuous influence over executive decisions at the point of formulation. It indicated the beginning of the formation of a new state structure in England politically under the command of the parliament, and not the king. The English parliament began to emerge as the supreme site of the nation's sovereignty. It acquired a defining role in the sovereign legislative function.The Triennial Act was, and remained, thus the political basis of the English Revolution (Yerby 2020, pp. 238-246).

7.5 The First Civil War: The King, Parliament and the Army, 1642-1646

The English Revolution of the 17th century was a political event and struggle for power between two opposite forces, the interest of both could not be reconciled with

each other. It obviously led the entire course of events to the point of resolution through violence. Both the king and the parliament were aware of this fact. Both started preparation for war. Between 1642 and 1646, England witnessed series of wars. Finally, the state system built by the Tudors and Stuarts in medieval and early modern period collapsed. In history, this war between the king and the parliamentarians came to be known as the First Civil War.

England was divided into two geographical parts as far as the influence of the both sides was concerned. While the Royalists were dominant in North, Wales and parts of the South-West in 1642-43, the anti-royalist forces controlled populous and economically prosperous southern and eastern half of England. Nevertheless, there were significant pockets within both geographical zones where the opposite forces were strong. The most important point is that the parliament had control over London throughout the war period, which was essentially symbolic. It symbolized the parliament's dominance over money and men during the period of war.Indeed, the control over London and the other ports gave the parliamentarians the ability to tap the major shares of the custom revenue. It provided the financial strength of the anti-Royalist forces. The English navy was also under the control of the parliaments. It helped the anti-royalist forces to maintain control of the coasts; it also secured the supply of two main resources of war–food and men. To be precise, the parliament was able to establish superior control over the resources-both money and men-during the English Civil War in comparison with the king. On the contrary, in the early stages of war, the parliament lacked trained armed forces whereas Charles possessed dashing cavalry. The historical evolution of the 17th century England would have been different if the king had won quick victories in the early years of war. It must be remembered that the parliamentarians were divided among themselves: the pro-war group, the pro-peace group and middle group. Each group competed with each other to gain support from the MPs. The leading military commanders of the parliamentarians–the earls of Essex and Manchester–were not ready to make a ruthless war against the king. However, Charles was irresolute in taking a firm decision, and consequently he did not achieve any decisive victory over the anti-royalist forces in 1642-43. It provided opportunities to the parliamentarians to consolidate their position. It was one of the turning-points in the history of English Civil War. Moreover, the financial strength of the anti-royalist forces was more

superior than the royalist forces. During this critical phase of war, the parliamentarians created 'New Model Army' under the command of Sir Thomas Fairfax and Oliver Cromwell. The vigorous attack of this newly constituted force brought victory over the king in the battle of Naseby in 1645. Charles was able to escape though his force was destroyed. He finally surrendered to the Scots (Smith 1997, pp. 309-312).

7.6 Interregnum

The term 'Interregnum' is commonly applied to the history of England between 1649 and 1660. During this period the country had no normal ruler. It is also an apt description of the period between the First and Second Civil Wars in all three kingdoms of the British Isles. King Charles, having lost control of Ireland and having been defeated in England and Scotland, became a prisoner ûrst of the Scots and then of the English. He was reduced to soliciting each of his captors to restore his authority on the best terms available. The situation in Ireland was tensed because of the continuation of war between the Confederates and parliament. In June 1646, the Confederates army was able to achieve a decisive victory over the parliamentary forces at Benburgh. It caused the defeat of the Protestant interest in Ireland. During the same time, the Scots handed over the king to the custody of the parliamentary forces. During this period, though the king was imprisoned, however, he was able to exert his influence both on the English and the Scots as neither the English nor the Scots could envisage post-war society excluding the King. Ireland became a battleground between the Catholics and the Puritans (Kennedy 2000, pp. 47-50).

In May, 1647 Charles agreed to the following proposals of the parliament:

a. He was ready to give concessions in the matters of religion and militia.
b. He was ready to accept the Presbyterian Government of the Church of England for three years as trial basis together with the Assembly of Divines at Westminster and the Directory of Worship as proposed by Parliament.
c. He also agreed on the parliamentary control over sea and land for ten years.

However, the situation was complicated by the new proposal offered by the New Model Army in August 1647. The fresh proposals were the result of the clash–both ideological and political–between the parliamentarians and the army. Ideologically

whereas Parliament was dominated by Presbyterians, religious Independents were influential in the army. Apart from the ideological differences, the professional grievances of the soldiers were handled by the parliament in an inept manner. The soldiers believed that they were free citizens currently deprived of the rights of liberty and freedom. They argued that the Presbyterian-dominated Parliament denied the liberty which Christ had ensured for them. This radical outlook of the New Model Army was supported by the Levellers. It indicated a departure from the original war aim of the parliamentarians. The division between the Presbyterians and the Independents became so critical that the radicals wanted to take military action in the form of march on London to subdue their opponents in the Parliament, to impeach the prominent Presbyterians and to support the Army's political allies–'the honest party in the House'-within the Parliament. This purge of the Parliament was to be accompanied by an assumption of control of the London militia, then mobilizing in the Presbyterian cause under the direction of a predominantly Presbyterian Parliament. Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) was against such raw military aggression towards Parliament and stood for negotiation with the king. This was opposed by the Agitators. In this perspective, General Henry Ireton (1611-1651) proposed new terms of peace on behalf of the Army: it is known as 'The Heads of the Proposal'. This proposal was forwarded to the king sidestepping the Parliament. On July 17, 1647, the Ireton's proposal was presented before the General Council. On July 28, 1647 formal negotiation between the king and the representatives of the Army was started; however, it failed and brought nothing. The division between the Army and the Parliament was also widened during this period. The General Council of the Army adopted 'The Heads of the Proposals' on August 1, 1647. It was also printed as public document stating the Army's programme. The Army marched on London and occupied Westminster briefly on August 6, 1647. It was followed by the reinstation of the Independent members while the Presbyterian members of the Parliament were at the risk of intimidation (Kennedy 2000, pp. 51-58).

The king saw this growing division between the parliamentarians and the Army (ideologically between the Presbyterians and the Independents) as an opportunity before him to regain authority and influence. During August and September 1647, Charles I was sure that he was indispensable to the settlement of peace seemed to be justiûed. Both Presbyterian Parliamentarians and Army generals sought king's

approval for their own proposals. On September 7, 1647, the Presbyterian members of the parliament sent the revised Newcastle Propositions to the king. The king replied that he was in favour of the Army's 'Heads of Proposals' as it would ensure peace. It made the Presbyterian members of the parliament angry. It must be mentioned here that the Heads of Proposals preferred the separation of church and the state. Dealing with the issues of the militia, Ireland and the Church, the Proposals gave Parliament control of the militia for ten years, left the prosecution of the war in Ireland to Parliament, and repudiated the Presbyterian claim to monopolize the Church settlement.However, the more radical section of the Army opposed the Heads of Proposals. Lieutenant-Colonel John Lilburne became an influential character in the newly emerging situation. Those who opposed the Heads of Proposals came to be known as the New Agitators. They believed the Heads of Proposals promoted the king's interest before the army and denied the liberty and independence of the masses. The Levellers of the city of London heavily influenced the political and religious opinion of the New Agitators. The rise of extreme radicalism within the Army actually manifested the fragmentation of opinion. The sharp articulation of the conflicting opinions within the Army exposed its inherent weaknesses (Kennedy 2000, pp. 58-62).

The Levellers wanted all freeborn English men to sign a social contract, an Agreement of the People, and to enjoy full participation in a democratic and decentralized state. All the office-holders were to be accountable to their constituencies and the holding of office would be for a limited period.

7.7 The Second Civil War, Revolution and Regicide, 1648-1649

In November, 1647 Charles escaped from the custody and took shelter in the Isle of Wight. Here Charles took a daring step to restore his authority: he started negotiation with a section of the Scottish nobility for military intervention, which would bring back his throne in return for a three-yearembrace of Presbyterianism. After the completion of the negotiation when both parties agreed, message was conveyed to the royalists in different parts of England to make revolt against the

parliament. The armed disturbances occurred in Kent, Essex, East Anglia, Yorkshire, and Wales. However, these insurrections were weak and poorly coordinated. Therefore, it was not a very hard task for Cromwell and Fairfax to defeat the royalist forces in England and Wales. Moreover, on August 17, 1648, Cromwell devastatingly crushed the combined royalist forces of England and Scotland at Preston. The parliament even after the defeat of the king was interested to negotiate with Charles. The army vehemently opposed this initiative of the parliament commonly known as Newport Treaty. Henry Ireton (1611-1651) drafted the Remonstrance of the Army at the army headquarters: the army being influenced by the Levellers wanted the trial of the king, the abolition of the kingship in England and adoption of the Leveller programme. The parliament refused to accept it. Then the army moved towards the parliament and excluded those members who wanted negotiations with the king. The army actually purged the parliament and this purged parliament came to be known as Rump. It immediately set up the High Court of Justice to try the king. Charles refused to accept the court procedure and its verdict. Nevertheless, he was given death sentence. On January 30, 1649, Charles was beheaded. The execution of Charles marked the end of an age in the history of England (Dewald 2004, pp. 281-282).

7.8 Conclusion

Historically, the phase of civil war was one of the most turbulent phases in the history of early modern England. It started with the question of the right of the king to impose tax without the consent of the parliament. It was a battle between the king and the parliament over the issue of power and authority. It was followed by the involvement of the army, which was mostly under the influence of the Leveller ideology. The involvement of the Levellers in the civil war radicalized the historical evolution of England during this period. The culmination of the entire process was the execution of Charles in the hands of the army. The kingship was abolished in England for time being with the establishment of Commonwealth and Protectorate. All these changes and transformations indeed marked the explosion of conflicting and competing social forces in England. The growth of trade, the rise of the gentry, the outlook of the members of the parliament, the role of the army and the articulation of the religious radicalism–all had cumulative effect on the political and

intellectual changes during the civil war. Violence was a necessary part of these prolonged changes. Consequently, it largely eliminated the old customs and traditional thought process from the society of early modern England. The country was on the threshold of a new era, that is, the end of the feudalism and rise of the commercial capitalism. The civil war was the symbol of these great transformations.

7.9 Model Questions

1. What were the peculiarities of the English social and political context in the 17th century?
2. What was the role of the merchant-gentry alliance in the 17th century political transformation of England?
3. Write an essay on the Long Parliament.
4. Discuss the various aspects of the First Civil War.
5. What was the role of the King, the Parliament and the Army in the history of England between 1642 and 1649?
6. What was Interregnum?
7. Do you think that the Second Civil War was inevitable in England?
8. Briefly analyze the historical significance of the English Civil War.

7.10 Suggested Readings

Cameron, Euan (Ed.). *Early Modern Europe. An Oxford History*. Oxford: OUP, 2001.

Cressy, David. *England on Edge. Crisis and Revolution, 1640-1642*. Oxford: OUP, 2006.

Dewald, Jonathan (Ed.). *Europe 1450 to 1789. Encyclopaedia of the Early Modern World*. *Volume 2.Cologne to Fur Trade*. New York: Thompson Gale, 2004.

Hill, Christopher. *The English Revolution 1640. An Essay*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1955.

Hill, Christopher. *Reformation to Industrial Revolution. The Making of Modern English Society, Vol I, 1530-1780*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.

Hill, Christopher. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. London: Routledge, 1980.

Hughes, Ann. The Causes of the English Civil War. Great Britain: Macmillan, 1988.

Kennedy, D. E. *The English Revolution, 1642-1649*. Great Britain: Macmillan, 2000.

Smith, Alan, G. R. The Emergence of a Nation State. The Commonwealth of England, 1529-1660. London: Longman, 1997.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-1642*. Oxford, Routledge, 2017.

Sturdy, David J. *Fractured Europe, 1600-1721*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Yerby, George. *The Economic Causes of the English Civil War. Freedom of Trade and the English Revolution*. New York: Routledge, 2020.

Unit 8 ❑ Commonwealth and Protectorate

Structure

8.0 Objectives

8.1 Introduction

8.2 The Rule of the Rump, 1649-53

8.2.1 The abolition of Kingship

8.2.2 Problems in Ireland and Scotland

8.2.3 The Other Difficulties

8.2.4 The Achievements of Rump

8.2.5 The End of the Rump Parliament

8.3 Oliver Cromwell and the Parliament of Saints

8.4 The Protectorate, 1653–8

8.5 Conclusion:Oliver Cromwell-An Assessment

8.6 Model Questions

8.7 Suggested Readings

8.0 Objectives

The major objectives of the present unit are to understand the political evolution of England under Commonwealth and Protectorate. The following areas will be highlighted in this unit:

- The rule of the Rump Parliament and the abolition of kingship in England.
- The rise of Oliver Cromwell in the English politics and the rule of the Protectorate.
- An assessment of Oliver Cromwell.

8.1 Introduction

The result of the Second Civil War was the establishment of a republic in England. It lasted from 1649 to 1660. The establishment of a republic in England was not only a revolutionary step but also an exceptional one. History witnesses the killing of several kings; however, England saw the legal death of a king. And the establishment of republic in England was a direct consequence of this event, that is, the legal death of a king. Nevertheless, the historians have agreed that the revolutionary activities between December 1648 and March 1649 reached a new level in England. It witnessed the trial and execution of king, the establishment of republic and the abolition of the House of Lords: all these unprecedented steps were carried out by a small minority group going against majority moderate group of the Parliament. It was, according to some historians, a military coup that suddenly changed the course of the history of England. In this unit, we will learn the role of the Commonwealth and Protectorate in England between 1649 and 1660. It will systematically analyse the following aspects of the historical evolution of England between 1649 and 1660: (i) the rule of Rump, (ii) Oliver Cromwell and the Parliament of Saints and (iii) the Protectorate.

8.2 The Rule of the Rump, 1649-53

The Rump Parliament undertook a series of significant steps to put an end the royalist influences on the English polity and to bring stability in the political and social structure. The fundamental aim was to establish the supremacy of the Rump Parliament in England. In this section, we will analyse this aspect of the political development of England.

8.2.1 The abolition of Kingship

The first task undertaken by the Rump Parliament was the abolition of kingship in England on the ground that it was ‘unnecessary, burdensome and dangerous to the liberty, safety and publicinterest of the people’, and ‘that for the most part, use hath been made of the regalpower and prerogative to oppress, impoverish and enslave the

subject'.Moreover, the House of Lords was also abolished on the ground that it was useless and dangerous to the people ofEngland'. It needs to be mentioned that the House of Lords did not extend its support to the proceedings against Charles I. The political authority was now fully assumed by the Rump Parliament. A Council of State was working alongside the Rump Parliament. The new state was declared as 'Commonwealth and Free State' under the ruleof a unicameral Parliament, and the government was entrusted to a Council of State under the provisional chairmanship of Cromwell (Lockyer 2005, 359; Stroud 1999, 127).

The radical sections of the English society–especially the Levellers-welcomed this move with an expectation of quick radical transformation of the society, religion and state. On the contrary, the Rump Parliament was not, however, very eager to transform the social structure: it stood in favour of the consolidation of the existing society. It made the Levellers utterly disappointed. In March 1649, John Lilburne published a pamphlet *England's New Chains Discovered*. They opined that the opportunity to establish the true freedom since the time of Norman conquest had been thrown away and the Rump Parliament started implementing only the notional and nominal things, and the actual burdens, bondages and grievances continued despite the establishment of republic. The Levellers wanted the dissolution of the Rump Parliament and the constitution of a new Parliament on the basis of universal male suffrage. Nevertheless, these demands were ignored. The growing radicalization of the English polity alarmed Cromwell. The Rump Parliament soon took stern measures to curb down the Levellers. Lilburne along with other prominent Leveller leaders was arrested. Cromwell with the help with Fairfax suppressed the army mutinies in London and Burford.Why did the Rump Parliament oppose the radical ideology of the Levellers? The fundamental reason was the class basis of the Rump Parliament. The majority of the members of the Rump Parliament belonged to gentry group of the society. They were in favour of conservative stability in the society and politics. The members of the Rump Parliament championed the hierarchy and privileges prevalent in the social structure. They were afraid of anarchy and social disorder, and eager to suppress any kind of radical ideology (Lockyer 2005, 359-360; Stroud 1999, 127).

8.2.2 Problems in Ireland and Scotland

Apart from the problem of the Levellers, the Rump Parliament also faced difficulties in Ireland and Scotland.Since 1641, Ireland had been in political tension with England. The situation became intensely tensed when a grand alliance was formed between catholic forces and royalists under the leadership of Duke of Ormonde. England apprehended the possibility of military attack by Charles II–the son of Charles I. assessing the situation, Cromwell was sent to Ireland to crush the rebels. Cromwell pursued a ruthless policy against the Levellers. His army was also disciplined and organized; they were even fully paid before the invasion against the Irish forces. In September and October 1649, Cromwell seized Drogheda and Wexford, which was followed by a brutal massacre of the civilian population. Another important aspect of the Cromwell's war against the Irish was that he considered the Irish as uncivilized nation of papists and they should be dealt with in a harsh manner. This racial and religious sentiments were widely prevalent also within the Cromwell's army. In 1950, Cromwell as asked by the Rump Parliament to deal with the Scottish problem. Cromwell also replaced Fairfax in the post of the commander-in-chief of the army. The Scots were required to be punished because they allied with Charles II. Immediately, Cromwell invaded Scotland and defeated the royalist forces at Dunbar. Charles II invaded England; however, Cromwell inflicted a crushing defeat on the Charles' forces in Worcester in September 1651. Charles II fled to the Continent. This victory of England marked the end of the possibility of the third civil war. It also established the command of the Rump Parliament in England (Stroud 1999, 127-128).

8.2.3 The Other Difficulties

It has been observed thatthe Rump Parliament did little between 1649 and 1653. The primary reason behind this inactivity was two-fold. Firstly, it lacked the required legitimacy to rule effectively. It was alienated from the much of the English political nation because of its involvement of regicide. It was the only one remaining part of the traditional three estates of Parliament. Its members had been elected back in 1641, and, of those, many had been purged by the army.It did not have a widely accepted popular support base in the English society. The activities of the county

committees and the high level of taxation also made the Rump Parliament unpopular. Secondly, the financial difficulty was another major issue before the Rump. It had to maintain a standing army,-the maintenance cost of which was substantial. Therefore, it had to impose high rate of tax on the common people. In these circumstances, what the Rump Parliament required a fresh election. However, the possibility of re-emergence of the royalist forces in the Parliament prevented it from taking this decision. It aggravated the problem of legitimacy of the Rump Parliament. Another area of difficulty faced by the Rump Parliament was its financial condition. Initially, the Rump Parliament had financial prosperity because of the seizure of the crown lands. Nevertheless, it had to clear all the arrears of the army. The war with Ireland, Scotland and the Dutch force imposed additional financial burden on the exchequer. In this perspective, the Rump Parliament was compelled to increase taxes. However, it did not solve the problem. By April 1653, it was facing a short-fallin revenue of £700,000(Stroud 1999, 128-129). Therefore, financially, the Rump Parliament was crippled from the beginning.

8.2.4 The Achievements of Rump

The Rump Parliament was extremely cautious in its activities. It was ready to accept the reform proposals, which were not radical in nature. For example, it accepted the demand of the Levellers to change the language in the legal proceedings from old French and Latin to English. However, it rejected the proposal to reform the law codes along biblical line. As far as the religious reforms were concerned, the Rump Parliament was equally cautious. It is true that the Rump repealed the regular attendance to the church. Nevertheless, it was not in favour of the complete religious toleration. The rise of the Ranters and Quakers was considered to be a threat to the social hierarchy and stability. The conservative approach was further reflected in the imposition of censorship and Blasphemy Act. It curtailed the liberty of expression in the English society. In order to restrict the evil activities, the Rump Parliament also introduced the Adultery Act. The activities of the Rump in the sphere of the foreign affairs were relatively more significant. In October 1651, the Navigation Act was introduced. It stipulated that all imports to England had to be carried either in the English ships or in the ships of those countries from where the import was made. This act aimed to curb down the influence of the Dutch power in the reading

activities of East and West Indies, North America and West Africa. In 1652, the English naval force under the leadership of Robert Blake defeated the Dutch power. This defeat compelled the Dutch to open up negotiations with England. It ensured the end of hostility between the two rival powers (Stroud 1999, 129-130).

8.2.5 The End of the Rump Parliament

The fundamental weakness of the Rump was its unrepresentative nature. It failed to claim that it represented the people of England's general interest unequivocally. England under the Commonwealth was administered by a small self-appointed oligarchy, which did not have any popular mandate. Therefore, the existence of the Rump Parliament was always vulnerable because of its inherent weaknesses since its foundation (Lockyer 2005, 363). The inability of the Rump Parliament to initiate constitutional reform finally prepared its way of its dissolution. It decided to dissolve itself in September 1651. However, the proposal was unclear. On April 1653, Oliver Cromwell lost his patience and entered the Parliament with his troops and forcibly dissolved the Rump Parliament. The Commonwealth's well-being now rested with its army, and more specifically in the hands of its commander-in-chief, Oliver Cromwell (Stroud 1999, 130).

8.3 Oliver Cromwell and the Parliament of Saints

After the dissolution of the Rump Parliament, the man who became the most influential in the England's political development, was Oliver Cromwell. He was the nephew of Thomas Cromwell. Oliver was born in 1599; nevertheless, before 1628 he was in an obscure position though Oliver was elected as a member of Commons in 1628. In 1640, he was able to participate in the national politics actively.It was clear from his parliamentary affairs that Oliver was in the favour of protecting the rights and privileges of the Parliament. The Civil War opened an opportunity to the advancement of his carrier. Before the beginning of actual hostility between the royalists and the parliamentarians, he seized the Cambridge Castle and the colleges' plate for Parliament in July 1642. After the starting of the Civil War, Oliver Cromwell emerged as a natural leader of the anti-royalist forces. In 1643, he secured

Lincolnshire for Parliament. His own regiment–the 'Ironsides'–was famous for its fighting ability; the Cromwell's force also stood for the liberty of the gospel and laws of the land. In 1644, he was promoted to the post of lieutenant-general. Oliver Cromwell also brought a crucial victory for the Parliament with his victory at Marston Moor in the summer of 1644. His growing importance was visible from his new promotion: Oliver Cromwell became the second-in-command of the New Model Army under Fairfax. In June 1645, Cromwell's cavalry force completely defeated the royalist force at Naseby. He was also emerging as a leading politician during this period. In 1648, Oliver Cromwell defeated the Scots in the battle of Preston. The credit of the pacification of the Irish forces and the defeat of the Scots in the Third Civil War, at Dunbar and Worcesterlargely went to him. Moreover, he was one of the key figures in bringing Charles I to the justice and trial. The entire trajectory of the rise of Oliver Cromwell was completed after the retirement of Fairfax in 1650 when he became the supreme commander of the army. After the dissolution of the Rump Parliament, Oliver Cromwell was the most influential personality of the English politics. His sweeping rise in the national level politics of England was largely due to the military victories, which Cromwell was able to achieve. He had the belief about himself that he was an agent of God's will. 'Providentialism' played a key role in shaping Cromwell's ideology and activities. We also need to understand that though he was conservative in his outlook, nevertheless, Cromwell also believed talent would stand over birth or wealth. Cromwell had no intention of shaking the foundations of English society, particularly at a time of acuteinstability. He accepted the suggestion of Major-General Harrison: it was theassistance of the puritan'saints' who had set up their Independent and sectarian congregationsthroughout England and Wales.It must also be remembered that Cromwell had hardly any interest in establishing a military rule after the dissolution of the Rump. He wanted to create a new governmental body for governance and administration in England. The Parliament of Saints was created accordingly. It was a nominated assembly. The army's Council of Officers nominated 140 members of this body. Major-General Harrison, who was a Fifth Monarchist, intended to set up this body with the Puritan 'saints', gathered from the various Independent and Separatist churches. However, in reality, all the members of the Parliament of Saints did not belong to the Saints as envisaged by Harrison. The Parliament of Saints was dominated by the landholders of gentry background. These

people were basically conservative. Therefore, the Parliament of Saints offered little radical programmes. (Stroud 1999, 130-133; (Lockyer 2005, 360-365).

The primary contradiction within the Parliament of Saints was that all the members were not ‘saints. Therefore, the clashes emerged soon between the ‘saints’ and the gentry. In its opening session (July 1653), Cromwell stated that the Parliament of Saints would discharge its responsibility for next one year only, and then a new body would be set up to take the responsibility. This proposal was in direct contradiction with Harrison and the hard-core members belonging to the saints, who were eager to seize this opportunity and to implement radical reforms in England. Therefore, the Parliament of Saints started its journey with uneasiness. During its five-month existence, the Parliament of Saints was able to pass thirty-five acts. Some members–radical in nature–were eager to introduce the reform in law following the principle of Old Testament. The Levellers and other radical groups wanted to reduce the size and complexity of law, to abolish tithes and the rights of holders of impropriatedtithes and also to rationalize the size of the army. It frightened the land holding gentry class of England. Cromwell was also in favor of maintaining the social stability. The gentry class viewed it as an attack on their property. WithCromwell’s encouragement, the moderates in the assembly met early on the morning of 12 December and voted the Parliament’s dissolution before the radical members had arrived. When the radicals attempted to hold a session anyway, they were cleared from the House by armed troops. The Parliament of Saints’ hope for a godly reformationfoundered on the rocks of conservatism(Stroud 1999, 133; Lockyer 2005, 365-366).

8.4 The Protectorate, 1653–8

The consecutive failures of the Rump Parliament and the Parliament of Saints created the conditions for a new rule in England. John Lambert, another general of Cromwell, proposed a new constitution, which was accepted by Cromwell. This written form of government came to be known as Instrument of Government. It clearly laid down the authority and power of the executive and legislature in order to drive out the possibility of any anarchy and misrule. It became clear from the

activities of the Rump Parliament and the Parliament of Saints that a strong executive was required in England to check the legislature. The Instrument therefore provided that 'the supreme legislative authority...shall be and reside in one person and the people assembled in Parliament, the style of which person shall be "The Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland."' However, Lambert made a subtle balance between the power of the Lord Protectorate and the legislature in his Instrument of Government. The constitution and power of the Parliament as well as the Council of State was made clear in the proposal of Lambert (Lockyer 2005, 366-367).

This written form of government explicitly laid down the modalities of power of the Executive and the Legislature in the following way:

The power of the Executive

- Executive power to be held by a Lord Protector (i.e. Cromwell), with the assistance of a Council of State. On his death, a new Protector would be elected by the Council.
- Vacancies on the Council to be filled by the Protector, choosing from nominees suggested by the Council and Parliament.
- Officers of State to be chosen with the approval of Parliament.
- The executive was to be in control of the armed forces, and a regular revenue was to be provided to maintain an army of 30,000. In addition, £200,000 was to be provided for the costs of running the Government. Any additional funds would depend on parliamentary approval.

The power of the Legislature

- Parliament was to be called at least once every three years, and could not be dissolved without its own consent.
- Its bills could be delayed by the Protector by up to twenty days, but thereafter they would automatically become law.
- The voting franchise was limited (in county seats it was changed from holding land worth 40 shillings or more per year, to those whose total wealth was calculated at £200 or more) thereby reducing the size of the electorate.

The Instrument also laid down articles on the practice of religion, which allowed freedom of worship to all, with the exception of Catholics, Episcopalians (those supporting the institution of bishops), and those who 'hold forth and practise licentious-ness', a catch-all phrase for sectssuch as the Ranters and Quakers (Stroud 1999, 133-135). The unicameral Parliament was to consist of four hundred members forEngland and Wales and thirty each for Scotland and Ireland. Some places not previously represented, such as Halifax, Leeds and Manchester, were given seats. Nevertheless, many decaying and rotten boroughs were disfranchised in a straight-forward way. The right tovote was confined to those who held property or goods worth £200, and at the same time, the number of county members was increased at the expense of the boroughs. In the Long Parliament there had been ninety representatives of the counties in a Lower House numbering more than five hundred members. Now, in a smaller House, there were two hundred and sixty-four. Cromwell preferred the notion of a Parliament dominated by the country gentry, the class of people from which he had sprung. However, the very spirit of the country gentry– often independent in nature-made them difficult partners in the business of government (Lockyer 2005, 367).

What was the nature of the 'Instrument of Government'? Was it a revolutionary in nature? Or was it a conservative document? The modern historians have viewed it as a conservative document? It actually restored the traditional pattern of government in England; the era of experiment and innovation was stopped. Only in the domain of religion, some advanced or progressive steps were taken. Cromwell believed in the religious liberty. He considered that the religious liberty was the greatest gain of the civil war. It may be mentioned that though the religious liberty was not extended to the Roman Catholics in theory, nevertheless, in reality, they also enjoyed the independence of their beliefs to some extent. The parliament of Protectorate was a supposed to be new institution based on the principles laid down in the Instrument of Government. However, the majority of the members belonged to the gentry class. The gentries had their own agenda. They were always in favour of protecting the socio-economic stability and property relationships. They also regarded themselves as the inheritors of the parliamentary tradition (Lockyer 2005, 367-369).

The political equation in the Parliament of Protectorate was subtle. The Councillors of State,officials of his household and members of the family of the Lord Protectorate

extended their support to the Lord Protectorate. However, there was no much attempt in organizing it as a constructive support base. Anticipating this organizational failure, the Republicans seized the opportunity and challenged the very validity of the 'Instrument of Government'. Cromwell in response surrounded the Parliament and asked the rebel members to accept the fundamental principle of rule by a single person and Parliament. The republicans decided to withdraw themselves from the Parliament and refused to acknowledge the Lord Protectorate and Instrument. Nevertheless, the withdrawal of the republican forces from the Parliament did not mean the end of the opposition to Cromwell within it. Many members saw the army under Cromwell as a threat to them. They wanted to reduce the size and influence of the army. They also wanted to create a militia, which would take many of the responsibilities currently undertaken by the army. Cromwell did not like this proposal; he did not also like the growing religious attitude of the some of the members of the parliament. It was evident that many of the members of the Parliament attacked the policy of the religious toleration of Cromwell. It must be mentioned that the growth of religious sects such as Baptists and Quakers alarmed the gentry class. The gentry was propertied class while the Baptists or the Quakers believed in the social equality. The gentry wanted strong steps against these rebel groups. However, Cromwell believed in the religious toleration. Even he was ready to dissolve the Parliament instead of deviating from the path of religious toleration. In January 1655, he dissolved the Parliament (Lockyer 2005, 369; Kishlansky 1997, 207).

After the closing of the session of the Parliament, Cromwell as Protectorate ruled England with the Council. It must be remembered that the rule of the Protectorate had a very narrow support base. The major sections of the English society were not ready to accept the rule of Cromwell. The royalists of the West Country returned to the Parliament. There was bitter and rancorous conflict among the various sects. The Fifth Monarchists–one of the older sects-were against the authority of Cromwell. They depicted Cromwell as Antichrist. The very foundation of the Protestant ideology was challenged by the comparatively newer sects like the Quakers. The Quakers under the leadership of George Fox were able to attract a section of the rural communities. This particular sect was truly democratic in both belief and action: from the very beginning, they accepted women as absolutely equals. The Quakers were in fact one of the most radical sect in early modern England. TheQuakers

preached universal redemption through the power of the innerlight of the Holy Spirit. They rejected the existence of heaven, of hell and of a personal God. Most controversially, they denied that the Biblewas the word of God.Rather they were ecstatic believers, and theirdoctrine of perfectibility led them to provocative demonstrations of purity such as going naked, fasting near to death, and attempting to perform miracles (Kishlansky 1997, 207-208). It indicates that England was undergoing a phase of intense conflict of ideas, of ideology and of power. Cromwell had to deal with this rising tension in England during the period under review. Cromwell gradually realized that there must be some sort of control on the activities of the radical religious sects without abandoning the basic principle of religious toleration. He, therefore, issued an order making it an offence to disrupt the church services. The size of the army was also reduced from sixty thousand to forty thousand. It substantially cut the cost incurred for army. Nevertheless, it failed to expand the support base of the rule of Protectorate. The royalists were still powerful in England. In 1655, under the leadership of John Penruddock, a rising was organized in Wiltshire. Though this anti-Protectorate uprising was easily suppressed, however, it indicated the existence of general apathy of the people to the regime under Cromwell (Lockyer 2005, 369-370).

Realizing the intensity of crisis, Cromwell finally imposed a direct military rule in the localities of England. He divided England into ten administrative units, and each unit was placed under the charge of one major-general. These people were entrusted for maintaining peace and order in the local areas, administrating economy and poor relief, upholding public morality, and enforcing godliness. Initiative was taken to organize a new militia in the local areas, the cost of which would be met from a ten per cent decimation tax on delinquent royalists. However, these steps of Cromwell proved more or less ineffective and finally unsuccessful as the trusted major-generals were more dependent on force rather than consensus based on discussion and dialogue. The rule of Protectorate was not finally grounded on broad-based constitutional system.Consequently, the legitimacy of the Protectorate was weak as it was not based on spontaneous consensus. In comparison with the internal policy, the foreign policy of Oliver Cromwell was relatively more successful. By 1651, Ireland and Scotland had come under the control of English. The influence of England was also expanding in Europe as well as in other parts of the world.

Cromwell was able to sign a treaty with the Dutch power in April 1654. The terms of the treaty were favourable to England and thereafter peace was maintained between England and the United Province. Cromwell also concluded treaty with Denmark. It opened up Baltic Sea to the English ships. Similarly, the treaty between the England and Portugal gave a secure access to the English merchants to the Portuguese colonies. Nevertheless, his military campaign to capture Hispaniola was unsuccessful in Spring 1655. Cromwell also took initiatives to transform the English navy a regular and organized force. The measures included stipulated promotion procedures and pay structure. During this period, under the general supervision of Cromwell and leadership of Robert Blake, England emerged as one of the principal maritime powers in Europe. Cromwell also made an alliance with France–the chief enemy of Spain–and in the Battle of the Dunes (June 1658), the Spanish forces was completely defeated. Dunkirk was captured, the privateer base was destroyed and it was then handed over to Cromwell as his reward (Lockyer 2005, 369-370). All these successes under the leadership of Cromwell made England's international position significantly high in the second half of the 17th century (Coward and Gaunt 2012, 301).

8.5 Conclusion: Oliver Cromwell-An Assessment

Oliver Cromwell died on 3 September 1658. He was succeeded by his son Richard. There was no opposition to this decision. However, within two years, the English monarchy was restored in 1660. Was the Restoration a symbol of the failure of the Cromwell's system of Protectorate? Why did the Protectorate fail to achieve legitimacy in spite of the fact that under the rule of the Protectorate England had greater religious toleration internally and diplomatic as well as military success abroad? An assessment of Oliver Cromwell and his regime is required to understand these questions and the England's historical transition towards the restoration of monarchy in 1660.

The biggest failure of Cromwell and his regime was that it failed to develop an alternative and acceptable form of constitution and consequently a government in England between 1640 and 1658. As a result, the measures adopted by Cromwell did

not have any lasting effect and failed to establish the rule of the Protectorate on a firm popular basis. The Cromwellian regime achieved considerable success in the contemporary international politics and foreign affairs. The English navy was able to dominate the high seas to a large extent. Internally, the Cromwell always tried to practice a firm policy of religious toleration as far as possible. However, all these steps and successes did not ensure a permanence, even relatively, of the rule of the Protectorate. Cyril Robinson argues that 'Cromwell's failure was not a failure of authority. He was never in serious danger of being overthrown. It lay rather in this, that he did notarrive at any adequate arrangement by which the people could have a say in the administration. He, the arch-enemy of despotism, could not bring himself to bring democracy its head. The result was that his rule failed to express the true wishes of the people. 'It grew more and more unpopular as time went on…' (Stroud 1999, 142). The primary reason of the failure was the England's historical transition from a personal rule to the parliamentary rule. The people of England actually refused to accept any authoritarian despotism and personal rule. It was the age of rising bourgeoisie and parliamentary democracy. The Cromwellian regime could not adjust with this fast changing political and social perspectives of the 17th century England. Therefore, despite the commendable achievements, the rule of the Protectorate did not last long. The people of England wanted a strong parliamentary democracy in their country not without a king. It prepared the way for the Restoration in 1660.

8.6 Model Questions

1. Write an essay on the rule of the Rump Parliament (1649-53) in England.
2. What was the achievement of the Rump Parliament?
3. Make a review of the rule of the Protectorate in England between 1653 and 1658.
4. Briefly discuss the achievements of the rule of the Protectorate.
5. Make an assessment of Oliver Cromwell.

8.7 Suggested Readings

Bucholz, Robert and Newton Key. *Early Modern England, 1485-1714: A Narrative History*. UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Cameron, Euan (Ed.). *Early Modern Europe. An Oxford History*. Oxford: OUP, 2001.

Coward, Barry and Peter Gaunt. *The Stuart Age: England, 1603-1714*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.

Hill, Christopher. *The English Revolution 1640. An Essay*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1955.

Kishlansky, Mark. *A Monarchy Transformed. Britain 1603-1714*. London: Penguin Books, 1997.

Lockyer, Roger. *Tudor and Stuart Britain, 1485-1714*.London: Routledge, 2005.

Morrill, John. *Stuart Britain. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP, 1984.

Thomas Munck. *Seventeenth Century Europe 1598-1700*. New York: Macmillan Education, 1990.

Smith, Alan, G. R. *The Emergence of a Nation State. The Commonwealth of England, 1529-1660*. London: Longman, 1997.

Stroud, Angus. *Stuart England*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Sturdy, David J. *Fractured Europe, 1600-1721*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002.

Unit 9 ❑ Restoration of 1660

Structure

9.0 Objectives

9.1 Introduction

9.2 Context of the Restoration

9.2.1 The Declaration of Breda

9.3 Charles II's Restoration Government in England

9.4 Restoration and Scotland

9.5 Restoration and Ireland

9.6 The Popish Plot

9.7 Constitutional significance of the Restoration

9.8 Conclusion

9.9 Model Questions

9.10 Suggested Readings

9.0 Objectives

The unit will discuss the restoration of the monarchical government in England which was the beginning point of the English Revolution.

9.1 Introduction

The term *Restoration* may apply both to the actual event by which the Stuart monarchy was restored, and to the period immediately before and after the event. Restoration, in the context of British History means that the monarchy was restored in England, Scotland and Ireland in 1660. Following the time of Oliver Cromwell's Commonwealth, it signified the return of Charles Stuart as monarch. After Charles II's death in 1685 his Catholic brother James II reigned but was overthrown by the Glorious Revolution of 1688. On 11 May, 1688, the Protestant son-in-law of James

II, William of Orange and his wife Mary accepted the Crown as co-regents, ending the Restoration period. The Restoration Era was marked by remarkable changes in English polity, society, economy and cultural trends. Religious tension was palpable throughout this period and influenced socio-political decisions.

9.2 Context of the Restoration

After nearly a decade of civil conflict, England did something extraordinary in 1649: they tried and executed their king for high treason. The following year, 1650, they established themselves as a commonwealth under Oliver Cromwell. Charles, the second son of Charles I and Henrietta Maria of France, led an army of 10,000 Scots to Worcester to confront Cromwell in 1651, but was defeated and fled to Europe. We will see how things developed in a few years, and Charles II was to return as the new king of England in 1660, marking the restoration of monarchy.

Despite his refusal to accept the Crown, Cromwell was King in all but name and soon began to exhibit royal characteristics. He governed in much the same way as Charles did, only summoning parliament when he needed money. Cromwell's regime quickly fell out of favour. Strict Protestantism was imposed, theatres were banned, and ale establishments across the land were closed. Military failures in a war against Spain harmed his reputation abroad, and England was essentially cut off from her European neighbours, who were concerned that unrest and dissatisfaction might spread to the continent. However, Oliver Cromwell was a powerful leader with a strong presence and commanded widespread support especially from the New Model Army.

When he died in 1658, his son Richard took over the throne. Richard quickly shown that he was not as skilled as his father. Furthermore, as commander of the army, Oliver had pushed the country into debt and left a power vacuum. The atmosphere got increasingly heated as Parliament and the New Model Army became increasingly sceptical of each other's motives. Cromwell was eventually forced to resign from power in April 1659 by George Monck, commander of the Scottish army. He retired gracefully as Lord Protector and was granted a pension. This prepared the path for the return of Charles I's exiled son, allowing the monarchy to be restored.

During the winter of 1659-60, army factions in England attempted to force their will on parliament, and then on each other, ending in coup and counter-coup, leaving England without a functioning government. This facilitated communication between fugitive king and royalists in England and Ireland. Public opinion in London and elsewhere had grown tired of the army's combat and the economic burden imposed on them to sustain the army. Monck demanded that the Rump of the Long Parliament dissolve itself in order to pave space for a new parliament in March 1660. Elections to the new parliament, known as a Convention Parliament because it was not convened by the king, were held in early April and resulted in a landslide victory for candidates with more moderate political and religious views.

9.2.1 The Declaration of Breda

Seeking to take advantage of the favourable political circumstances, Charles immediately fled to Dutch territory, rejecting late offers of support from the French and Spanish. On 4 April, Charles sent a declaration from Breda in the Netherlands, assuring parliament, the army, the fleet, and the City of London that he would rule through parliament, that religious toleration would be offered to 'Tender Consciences... which do not disturb the Peace of the Kingdom,' and that he would only seek vengeance against a small portion of those men who had brought about his father's execution. By doing so, he declared that he did not seek to restore Britain to its pre-Civil War state, but rather that he wished to govern through the 'kings, peers, and commons'.

When the declaration was presented to the Convention Parliament on 1 May 1660, it was accepted first by the reconvened House of Lords (which had been abolished in February 1649), then by the Commons, and the king was declared King on 8 May. The route was now clear for him to leave the Netherlands, and on May 25, 1660, he embarked for Dover, arriving in London on May 29, his 30th birthday, to take the crown his father had lost. Since this reinstated the monarchy in the United Kingdom, his reign is known as the Restoration. In May 1660, Charles Stuart was restored to the thrones of England, Scotland, and Ireland. In English history, this was a stunning and dramatic turn of events.

9.3 Charles II's Restoration Government in England

Charles was careful to avoid repeating his father's mistakes, and there was a general pardon for those who had fought against the Restoration. He could not, however, forgive the individuals who had ordered his father's execution. Nine of them were executed. Cromwell's body was excavated from Westminster Abbey and hung at Tyburn.

The king was determined to solidify his position as soon as possible. On May 27, Charles convened his council for the first time on English soil in Canterbury. On May 31, when the true business of government began, the council assembled at Whitehall. With the monarch there, the first order of business was to recognise the validity of the Convention Parliament, which had met without the king's consent. Following that, the council promptly addressed the necessity to ensure that judicial procedures continued without interruption so that the legitimacy of the courts' decisions could not be disputed. The king also directed that the army and navy continue to pay their personnel.

The Cavalier Parliament was the first English Parliament formed following Charles II's restoration to the throne. Its tone was first passionately royalist, but as time passed, its membership shifted and it grew increasingly critical of many of Charles' initiatives. The Cavalier Parliament is well remembered for enacting harsh restrictions against Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters. The Parliament elected in 1661 was adamant about achieving an unwavering Anglican and royalist solution. The Militia Act of 1661 granted Charles unprecedented ability to keep a standing army, while the Corporation Act of 1661 empowered him to expel dissident officials from the boroughs. Other regulations restricted the press and public assembly, while the 1662 Act of Uniformity established educational limitations. The main benefactors of Charles II's restoration were an exclusive group of Anglican clergy and a well-armed landed gentry. In the weeks following the Restoration, the royal government strained to keep up with the volume of work, but the monarch was fast in filling offices with officials or re-appointing those doing the job whose allegiance could be trusted.

Between 1665 to 1667, England was at war with the Dutch, and in 1667, the Dutch sank five British ships, which reflected poorly on Charles' foreign policies. Charles created a new alliance with France in the 1670s. However, the French only agreed to back Charles if he restored Catholicism in England. Charles took great care to keep this clause hidden. The Parliament vehemently opposed both the Entente with France and the Dutch War. Furious with the king's move in the Dutch War, the Parliament demanded that the notification be reversed before approving any supplies. In order to sign a peace pact with Holland, Charles II was forced to rescind the proclamation. Not content with this, the Parliament compelled Charles II to sign the Test Act of 1673, which forbade nonconformists of all types from serving in any capacity within the executive branch of government. Catholics were not permitted to hold office in the Parliament as per the Test Act of 1678. Charles II did not have a son but on the issue of succession the Parliament tried to stop his brother James II from succeeding his brother Charles II, since he was a devoted Catholic. Parliament was unsuccessful in preventing the accession of James II. But ultimately James II and his son were expelled by the Glorious Revolution of 1688.

Charles controlled Britain competently without entering into any altercation with the Parliament as far as possible. The Parliament's power also gradually increased throughout his reign. When things went awry, Charles made his ministers scapegoats. The Earl of Clarendon, his tutor, accepted responsibility for the unpopular Dutch war; the King, too, deceived and manipulated his five advisers known as the Cabal. Laurence, First Lord of the Treasury, Clarendon's son, was the one who gave Charles the nickname "The Merry Monarch." "He never spoke a dumb thing and never did a wise thing," he added, before responding with a double-edged retort, "My words are my mine, and my acts are those of my ministers."

9.4: Restoration and Scotland

George Monck, governor-general of Scotland, was essential in the restoration of Charles II. The latter was proclaimed king at Edinburgh on 14 May 1660. During the Wars of the Three Kingdoms, there was an universal pardon for offences, but there were exceptions and executions. Scotland regained her separate legal system,

parliament, and kirk (church/Church of Scotland) under the ultimate political settlement. However, Scotland reclaimed the Lords of the Articles and bishops. Through a series of commissioners, beginning with the Earl of Middleton and concluding with the King's brother and heir, James, Duke of York, Charles II controlled Scotland without regard to Parliament. The reinstatement of the Scottish Episcopacy (church governing structure) resulted inconflicts between the Presbyterians and the bishops belonging to the Episcopalian order.

When Charles died in 1685, his brother, the Duke of York, took over as James VII of Scotland and II of England. He survived numerous rebellions, but his Catholicism and policies alienated a large portion of the political nation. The Presbyterians controlled the Scottish Convention called by William of Orange. It offered the kingdom to William and Mary, and following the loss of James' supporters, the bishops were dissolved and a Presbyterian system was reinstalled in the kirk.

9.5 Restoration & Ireland

In the months before Charles II was restored in May 1660, the established settlers—who had been the primary beneficiaries of the recent confiscation of Catholic estates—asserted themselves to seize the political initiative. The Cromwellian conquest of Ireland (1649-1653) had resulted in huge transfers of land but not commensurate immigration. Despite their real wish for the monarchy to return, they were adamant about protecting the land settlement by barring Catholics from holding political office.

Catholics were no longer allowed to sit in the Irish parliament at the urging of Protestants in Ireland, who understood that maintaining political power was essential to maintaining the land settlement. The right to vote was not restricted, but the loss of property and the subsequent change in power in the towns—which had become Protestant strongholds—greatly diminished the Catholic vote's power. Control of military force served as a supplementary settlement pillar. Between 5,000 and 7,000 soldiers made up the standing army, which served as an internal security force throughout several local garrisons and was twice as big as the prewar army. It

progressively became a primarily Anglican force after the introduction of the need for attendance at divine service.

9.6 The Popish Plot

The Popish Plot of 1678 was an elaborate tissue of fictions and half-truths. Titus Oates, a former Anglican cleric, alleged that that Roman Catholics planned to murder Charles in order to make James a conservative Catholic, the king. Charles was not convinced but he had to give way to national hysteria that clamoured from barring James accession to the throne after him. The fear seemed real as Charles II did not have a legal heir. Charles came dangerously close to losing control of his administration between 1679 and 1681. The monarch was forced to give the earl of Shaftesbury and his Whig supporters—men he hated—positions of authority in both the national and local governments because they supported the authority of the Parliament. On February 6, 1685, Charles passed away but not before he became a Catholic himself, accepting his Catholic leanings in a way though throughout his reign he remained pragmatically tolerant.

9.7 Constitutional significance of the Restoration

The historian G.M. Trevelyan made the memorable observation that Parliament summoned the monarch in 1660. The fact that in the word "parliament" Trevelyan capitalised the 'P' indicates a difference: it no longer simply refers to a gathering of representatives gathered at the king's command. It had already demonstrated its own validity, which it later reaffirmed in an Act that received Charles II's approval.

The House of Lords was reinstated immediately. The clergy who had been expelled from their livings as well as the Church of England's organisational structure from before the Commonwealth (the time when Cromwell had controlled England as a republic) were reinstated. Legislation was also approved by Parliament to ratify the king's commitments. Feudal tenure was ultimately abolished, and a new standing army was established. The oldest regiments of the British Army originate from the year 1660. Manorial lords now owned their land freehold rather than being

subject to the king's control. Feudal rights owed to the monarch were abolished in exchange for a £10,000 yearly payment.

We saw the emergence of two political parties during the Restoration era-the Whig and Tory parties. The Tories backed the king, while the Whigs opposed him. The 1679 Act of Habeas Corpus, one of the most important pieces of legislation in the nation, protecting people from unjustified imprisonment, was a magnificent result from the parliamentary entanglements. It was rumoured at the time that the only reason it was successful was because Lords in the Upper House enjoyed counting a really corpulent member as 10.

The English Restoration, which followed almost two decades of civil war and democratic experimentation, is probably more notable for what it did not do than for what it did. Many of the same problems that sparked conflict in 1642 were still present, including the monarchy's continued need for tax revenue to run the country and finance war efforts and England's ambiguous theological landscape.

After all of this, it is arguably most significant to remember that England survived this turbulent time with a robust constitutional monarchy.

No monarch would ever again attempt to raise arms against Parliament to impose unpopular taxes or laws, and Parliament would never again go more than ten years without meeting as it had just before war broke out. The constitutional monarchy established after the civil wars and codified by the English Restoration endured despite a number of unresolved social and economic challenges.

Under Charles II and his brother, who succeeded him as James II in 1685, the 'normal' relationship between kings and Parliaments was, in theory, restored. However, a few things had altered. The fact that Charles II held onto the 1661 Parliament for eighteen years without a general election highlighted how governing had started to look unachievable without partnership with Parliament. Neither monarch attempted to generate money without Parliament's approval. James II was deposed in 1689 and replaced by his eldest daughter Mary and her husband, William, Prince of Orange, as a result of his attempts to secure the election of a Parliament that would overturn the Test Act (which barred Catholics from holding public office.

9.8 Conclusion

Even though Cromwell narrowly defeated England's republican experiment, the Commonwealth and Restoration were crucial in establishing the authority of Parliament and permanently shifting the country's political balance in favour of a constitutional monarchy. A precedent for Parliament to remove the monarch was established when James II was replaced by William and Mary in a deal that placed even more restrictions on the monarch.

9.9 Model Questions

1. Discuss the background of the Restoration of 1660.
2. What was the declaration of the Breda?
3. Elucidate the workings of the government of Charles II in England.
4. How did the restoration impact Scotland and Ireland politically?
5. Write a short note on the significance of the Restoration.

9.10 Suggested Readings

Keeble, N.H. *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*, John Wiley and Sons, 2008.

Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685*, Penguin Books, 2006.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe In Transition: From Feudalism to Industrialization*, New Delhi, 2013.

Unit 10 ❑ Socio-Economic Changes

Structure

10.0 Objectives

10.1 Introduction

10.2 Religious Restoration

10.2.1 Effects of the new religious policy

10.3 Social changes

10.4 Economic changes

10.5 Conclusion

10.6 Model Questions

10.7 Suggested Readings

10.0 Objectives

The unit will enquire about the socio-economic changes that occurred during the restoration era of England.

10.1 Introduction

Restoration has been often described as a type of revolution as we see in the restoration of 1660, there was no exception. The English Restoration, according to Leopold Von Ranke, was a legislative revolution. The main argument in favour of recalling Charles II was that a legislative government could not be established without a king. The restoration resulted in the restoration of both the King and the Parliament. The restoration had a huge impact on society and the economy. As in the case of political dealings the religious questionremained highly centralas both the economy and society underwent changes.

10.2 Religious Restoration

In the post-restoration age, the religious question presented the greatest difficulty. Conflicts over religion that were sparked by the Reformation and the Tudor transitions between Anglican and Roman Catholic power had never been settled. King and Parliament relations remained tense as well. Charles promised to protect the Anglican Church while allowing religious tolerance in the Declaration of Breda 1660, which set forth the principles of restoration. However, many members of Parliament were clearly bigoted, which only served to reorient him toward Catholic sympathies fostered on the Continent.

The Convention Parliament was unable to address religious issues because the major parties could not come to an agreement. The Council of Presbyters debated the bishop's power in great detail. He expected to become more royalist following the election of a new Parliament because social restoration was moving forward and religious restoration had been put off. Only 60 seats in the new Parliament, which was seated in May, were reserved for Presbyterians.The Solemn league and Covenant of 1643, were to be burned by the common hangman, per the decision of the new Parliament, which mandated that all members participate in the sacrament in accordance with Church of England customs. It constituted treason to harm a person or make a distinction between a person and their office since the monarch held the authority to command the army. Five years of work were put in by the new Parliament before the religious agreement was passed. These rules destroyed the Puritans' assertion of political dominance, reduced their religious authority, restricted their social influence to the middle class and lower classes, and created a new social structure.

The Clarendon Code was a collection of four laws passed between 1661 and 1665 that successfully restored the Anglican Church's dominance after the interlude of Cromwell's Commonwealth and put an end to religious tolerance. The Code was given its name in honour of Charles II's Lord Chancellor, Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon....the laws enacted after the Restoration that compelled the country to comply and restored the Church of England under bishops' rule. They did not reflect the opinion of Lord Clarendon, Charles II's top minister, but rather the values, goals,

and vengeance of the cavalier majority in Parliament. Despite his personal objection to several of the Code's provisions, Clarendon upheld the legislation.

The Corporation Act was the first in the series. Only people who had taken communion in accordance with Church of England doctrine, renounced the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643, and swore not to use force against the king were allowed to participate in municipal bodies that oversaw elections to the Parliament and conducted town affairs under the terms of the Corporation Act, which was passed in 1661. This law had the result of barring nonconformists from holding public office. Puritan clergy were dismissed from their positions as a result of their opposition to using the English Prayer Book when an Act of Uniformity was passed the next year and made the use of the English prayer book mandatory in English churches. Nearly 2000 clerics were compelled to abandon their positions because they refused to follow this law. The Conventicle Act of 1664 made attending conventicles, or gatherings of nonconformists, a crime subject to imprisonment. For the first two offences, the penalty was imprisonment; for the third offence, it was transportation under the fear of execution if the offender were returned to England. This law prohibited conventicles, which are gatherings for unauthorised worship, with more than five attendees who are not family members. The intention was to stop dissenting religious organisations from gathering. Pastors and educators were prohibited from travelling within five miles of a city or corporate town under the terms of the 1665 Five Miles Act unless they swore an oath never to attempt to change the state's or the church's system of government. The Five Miles Act was created to reflect the fact that most Puritans lived in towns and cities. The act effectively barred Puritans from attending even private schooling because they preferred to live in towns and cities. The Puritan population in England began to fall rapidly before this action. The Clarendon Code's final act, which targeted nonconformist pastors, was not repealed until 1812.

Some historians assert that he pretended to accept all nonconformists in order to avoid Parliamentary opposition to his religious objective of transforming the Church of England into the Church of Rome. He wanted to reinstate Catholicism in England through the Dover Treaty, which he signed with France. However, Charles supposedly extended the Protestants tolerance by suspending all criminal prohibitions against

nonconformists of any kind in a proclamation of indulgence before to the third Dutch War.

10.2.1 Effects of the new religious policy

The Clarendon Code served as more than just a deterrent to punishment. It was based on legislation passed by the Puritans during their time in power to target the Church of England. Because of their intense hatred toward their long-gone rulers and their belief that avenging them should be their top priority, the Justices of the Peace were given the responsibility of upholding the law. The Conventicle Act resulted in John Bunyan, the author of 'The Pilgrim's Progress', serving twelve years in jail. The Clarendon Code's greatest impact, however, lay not in the persecution it inflicted but rather in the enormous social change it sparked, especially through its first two Acts, the Corporation Act and the Act of Uniformity.

The Clarendon Code effectively ended any possibility of the Anglican Church and Nonconformists coming together under one religious and social banner. The religions of Britain were deeply polarized, and religious intolerance would be an ever-present feature of British life for at least the next century. The Clarendon Code's lasting impact was to pave the way for a crucial aspect of modern society known as "the rigorous and exceptional influence of class on religious adherence in England." To maintain their social standing and political rights, the Puritans hastily embraced the dominant faith. The local Whig chiefs were then picked from among the many families around the country that had taken this step. Even while some left the country, the majority of those who suffered the most extreme persecution—which was worse under the Clarendon Code than it was under Laud—remained in England. It was from this outcast element that a free party system's counterbalance evolved. The Clarendon Code also caused a big drop in religious fervour. During this time, hymn writing was the only contribution made to religion.

Charles II's religious policy led to a huge societal transformation in the first place. To retain their social standing, the Puritans hastily embraced the dominant faith. Another social consequence that laid the way for a crucial component of modern times was the strict and noticeable impact of class on religious attendance in England. The English populace included both conformists and nonconformists.

The removal of the latter from positions of leadership reduced the number of persons who cared about social status or social aspirations. Second, the numerous families around the country who had chosen to quickly adapt to the established Church were eventually chosen to act as the regional Whig party leaders. Thirdly, Charles II's economic strategy on religion led to the rise of the Quakers and Sectaries, who were manufacturers, merchants, and bankers. The Puritans' emphasis of hard work and sobriety contributed to business success. In the end, economic theories and business practices at the time prevailed over religious disagreements.

10.3 Social changes

Church courts were reinstated along with the reinstatement of the episcopal hierarchy. Many doctors, surgeons, teachers, and midwives flocked to present themselves and apply for licences to practise, even though they had effectively been able to obtain official recognition of their professional position for more than ten years. In an archdeaconry or a consistory court, you may once more prove a will locally starting in 1660. Once more, neighbours may be reported for moral transgressions including bigamy, adultery, and drunkenness with the expectation that the wrongdoers would be called before the archdeaconry court. After being outlawed by Cromwell, Latin, the language of the courts, made a reappearance.

The Puritan government of the interregnum had a strict policy on moral crime, dealing with offenders in the secular country courts and assizes rather than in the church courts. The Adultery Act, which allowed for the death penalty for anyone found guilty, was passed by the Commonwealth government in 1650. The legislation hung over the heads of many even though it was so severe that it was only enforced a few times. More strictly enforced were the prohibitions on swearing (even the phrase "as God is my witness" might result in a fine), the opening of alehouses, and violating the Sabbath. On Sundays, constables might search kitchens to make sure no pointless work was being done. On the Lord's Day, no trading, purchasing, or agricultural activity was allowed, and even taking a romantic stroll could result in a fine. A maidservant who was discovered on a Sunday repairing her dress was denounced to the authorities and punished by being put in the stocks outside in the

rain. Therefore, the Commonwealth government's decision to repeal this law represented a significant reduction in social oppression for people who led regular lives. It was a joyful relief to learn that adulterers would once again be subject to a period of humiliation in a white sheet at the church door or in the marketplace rather than being hanged.

Charles already had an acknowledged illegitimate child with Lucy Walter when he arrived in England, and everybody who knew him was aware that she would not be the last of his mistresses. The previous administration, had until recently dealt individuals like him with the utmost harshness, stands in stark contrast to the libidinous king. Samuel Pepys, a famous diarist, was astounded by the king's affairs' transparency. He gave his offspring who were not his biological children titles as well. Furthermore, Charles tolerated the rakes rather than severely punishing them. The rakes were fighting back against the puritans in society, just like the monarch himself with all of his women. Their actions were intended to shock and make fun of people who had beheaded Charles I.

The king's return ushered in more subtle, all-pervasive changes that went beyond this. An aristocratic renaissance resulted from the return of aristocratic power and the waning of moral norms that were restricting in nature. The fashion for hierarchy returned as people began to openly display their wealth. In contrast to the 1650s, when the interests of the Commonwealth had publicly dominated, conspicuous consumerism was allowed to run wild starting in 1660. Foreign fashions were imported, embraced, and then abandoned after about a year. The amount of textiles coming from the orient, such as Indian chintzes, rose. As the urban and middle classes once more adopted the fashionable practices of the gentry and nobility, new commodities like tea, coffee, and chocolate were also transported to England in much higher quantities.

Gambling was prohibited under the Commonwealth so it was carried out in a covert fashion. However, it was not only carried out in public under the reign of Charles II, but also on a grand scale. By 1664, the government had to pass the Gaming Act, which rendered gambling debts greater than £100 unenforceable due to issues with heirs wagering enormous estates. Nevertheless, others kept placing large bets carelessly. The Complete Gamester author Charles Cotton wrote in 1674 that

several estates totaling more than £2,000 per year had just been squandered at cards and tables. These were not the only venues where people squandered their wealth: bowling greens, cricket grounds, gold courses, pall-mall courses, and tennis courts were all sites where great sums were gained and wasted. At 1667, a wrestling bout in St James's Park between men from the West Country and those from the North was held for a payout of £1,000 in addition to all wagers placed on the outcome. Such a spectacle could not have occurred during Cromwell's reign. Gambling was at the heart of the sport of kings, which, like wrestling, pall-mall, and many other sports, was outlawed or prohibited by the Puritans. After his ascension, one of the new king's first athletic pursuits was to reopen Newmarket, which Cromwell had left in ruins. It immediately became one of the country's most popular horse-racing destinations. Gambling was so popular that gentlemen began to wager on their footmen, and for the first time in England, races between runners were staged.

If the wealthy's recreational hobbies changed dramatically in 1660, so did those who were more engaged in popular games and blood sports. The Commonwealth had made bear baiting illegal, not because it was cruel to animals, but because of the crimes that spectators may participate in: drinking, betting, and wearing. Cromwell's men shot all of London's bears, and fighting cocks had their necks wrung. The Restoration also heralded the return of these popular pastimes, as well as traditions like Sunday football and maypole dance. Most notably, Cromwell had prohibited individuals from celebrating Christmas as it was considered to be a mere superstition.

As a result, shops were not permitted to close and church ministers were not permitted to preach on Christmas Day. People were not allowed to eat mince pies, plum porridge, or brawn in December, or decorate their homes with holly and ivy boughs, or sing carols, or pass around the wassail bowl, or offer children and slaves food in boxes (thus the name "Boxing Day"). Critics who thought this was going too far issued tracts questioning the innocence of 'Old Father Christmas,' who thus made his first appearance in English culture as a puritanical protest figure. All of this prohibition came to an end with the restoration of the monarch.

It was the same with music and the theatre as it was with sports, gambling, games, and season festivities. Although Cromwell did not outright ban music, he did order that it be removed from churches. The disbandment of the cathedral choirs and

the chapel royal, as well as the dismissal of court musicians, were important defeats for the profession. Even popular music suffered: magistrates took measures to prevent filthy songs from being played in public places. The restoration of the king essentially overnight infused new life into the art of music-making, since the court demanded a chapel royal staff and court musicians, and ordinary people went back to their old favourite songs and created more of them without fear of punishment.

The theatres had all been closed down by 1642. The Globe was demolished, and tenements were constructed on the site. The return of the monarch and his brother, the Duke of York, who both served as patrons of play and lent their names to new London theatre companies, was a great step forward. It marked the beginning of England's second great age of theatrical writing.

The Restoration demonstrates how important dynasties and dates can be. In terms of developments, the year 1660 is comparable to a continental shelf in that the new government had a dramatic impact on everyone socially, in their daily lives.

During Charles' reign, London was afflicted by the Plague, a devastating epidemic, and the Great Fire in 1665-6. These calamities killed about 70,000 people and destroyed huge areas of the city. Following the Great Fire, he tasked his childhood buddy, Christopher Wren, with rebuilding London. Wren designed almost 50 new churches, including Saint Paul's Cathedral.

Simultaneously, Charles' tolerant, libertarian spirit enabled the arts and sciences to flourish once more. Dryden, Etheredge, and Sedley wrote witty, immoral plays that piqued the King's interest. The masterpieces of Bunyan and Milton, Pilgrim's Progress and Paradise Lost, resonated less with the mood of the day, but the authors had more freedom to express themselves.

Charles' interest in science led to his patronage of the Royal Observatory at Greenwich, which was run by the first astronomer-royal, John Flamsteed. In 1660, he also founded the Royal Society in London with the goal of "increasing Natural Knowledge." Isaac Newton developed his theories of gravity; Robert Boyle directed modern chemistry away from ancient alchemy; Richard Lower performed the first animal-to-animal blood transfusion; and Edmund Halley predicted the return of the comet named after him. Thus the Restoration was also a period of scientific advance.

Due to his love of music and great entertainment, Charles II was dubbed the "merry monarch."

10.4 Economic changes

The restoration caused landlords and landowners to be squeezed between falling property values and rising taxes, which accelerated the consolidation of agricultural capitalism. The wealthy landlords evicted a lot of smaller ones. Larger, more potent, and frequently more efficient farmer tenants were able to defeat the smaller ones as competition for markets increased. Agricultural development supported both the industry and the expanding population, even though the new trend was problematic for many small landowners. Thus, during the restoration, the English landlord class cemented its links to agrarian capitalism. Its influence over the English Parliament increased along with several business organisations that became key players in international trade.

The restoration also marked the beginning of a tremendous period of commercial expansion in global trade. Many merchant groupings saw vertical expansion by foraying into the more contemporary commercial sectors. Foreign dealers started to take over the English market for new draperies after 1660. The Levant Company's merchants prospered greatly as a result of the Royal monopoly, and a new group of merchants climbed to the ranks of the aristocracy by participating in and profiting from the Levant trade. However, the most impressive profits were earned by long-distance traders with Asia, the West Indies, North America, and Africa.

Due to the huge prosperity of the East Indian trade, more and more squatters started to demand monopoly of the chartered joint stock companies. The wealthy merchant class provided the Tory leadership strength by supporting the monarchy for the future. Trade in sugar and tobacco between the United States and the West Indies increased in less than fifty years. After the many barriers to trade and commerce growth were eliminated, re-export trade grew even more quickly. The Revolution of 1688 brought about several long-term socioeconomic growth patterns that had begun in the early modern era.

10.5 Conclusion

After the restoration in 1660, English society and the economy therefore entered a new era. This made possible a second revolution, the "glorious" revolution of 1688.

10.6 Model Questions

1. Write a note on the religious policy of Charles II.
2. Write a short note on Clarendon Code.
3. What were the different Acts under the Clarendon Code.
4. What were the features of the religious policy of Charles II.
5. The Restoration heralded what changes in the society?
6. Discuss the economic changes brought about by the Restoration.

10.7 Suggested Readings

Keeble, N.H. *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*, John Wiley and Sons, 2008.

Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685*, Penguin Books, 2006.

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe In Transition: From Feudalism to Industrialization*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Unit 11 ❑ The Revolution of 1688

Structure

11.0 Objectives

11.1 Introduction

11.2 The Background

11.3 English Bill of Rights

11.4 Nature of the Revolution

11.5 Conclusion

11.6 Model Questions

11.7 Suggested Readings

11.0 Objectives

At the end of the unit the learners will be able to understand:

- The background of the Revolution of 1688.
- The consequences of the Revolution of 1688.

11.1 Introduction

In the bloodless 'Glorious' Revolution of 1688–1689, Protestant Mary II and her Dutch husband, Prince William III of Orange, overthrew Catholic King James II of England and assumed his position as monarch. The revolt, which was motivated by both political and religious factors, led to the adoption of the English Bill of Rights in 1689. This fundamentally altered how England was ruled. The foundations of contemporary political democracy were laid as the Parliament expanded its authority over the regal monarchy's prior absolute dominance.

11.2 The Background

Tensions between Protestants and Catholics were already high when after the death of Charles II, his brother James II came to power in England in 1685. James, a devoted Catholic himself, increased Catholics' freedom of worship and gave Catholics preference when choosing military commanders. Many English citizens were outraged by James' apparent religious preference and his close diplomatic links to France, which stoked serious political tension between the king and the British Parliament. The Whigs, a significant political group whose members preferred a constitutional monarchy over James' absolute monarchy, presented James with the strongest resistance in Parliament. The Whigs were particularly angered by the threat that James' rule provided to the possibility of a long line of Catholic succession to the throne, especially after their failed attempt to enact a measure to remove him from the throne between 1679 and 1681.

In March 1672, James controversially extended religious liberty by his Royal Declaration of Indulgence by suspending all laws punishing Protestants and Roman Catholics who had rejected the Church of England. James II tried to establish a new Parliament later that year that would agree never to challenge or oppose his rule in accordance with the absolutist "divine right of kings" ideology. When James II's Protestant daughter Mary II became pregnant she allegedly pledged to raise her as a Catholic. Since Mary II was the only legitimate heir to the English throne, fear quickly spread that this alteration in the royal line of succession would lead to an English Catholic dynasty. The flame of revolution was thus fanned by James' ongoing efforts to extend Catholic emancipation, his unpopular friendship with France, his disagreements with the Whigs in Parliament, and the uncertainty surrounding his heir. The nobility were unhappy with James and they encouraged William of Orange to visit England. In addition to being a Protestant prince who could aid the nation, William of Orange was asked to take action since he was wed to Mary, James' daughter. William received legitimacy and a sense of continuity as a result of this. However, it was unclear at the time what to do. Since William was a Protestant, some wanted him to take James' place outright, while others believed he might help with a solution and lead James in a far more amenable direction. Others hoped that James would be effectively scared into reigning more cooperatively

by the threat of an invasion by William. A lot of people were against replacing James at all because they feared that the civil war would break out again. A return to the deadly anarchy that had previously restored a Stuart king to the throne was not desired in order to usurp another monarch because it was still within living memory.

However, by June 30, 1688, the nation had become so repulsed by James' tactics of arbitrary rule that a letter was despatched to Holland requesting the arrival of William and his troops. William duly started making plans. James spent an excessive lot of time lamenting the lack of the country's devotion for him in letters to his daughters, each of which was more sentimental than the others, while also experiencing awful nosebleeds during this time. William did not actually arrive in England for several months; on November 5, he landed in Brixham, Devon, uncontested. He and his wife Mary would have to wait a few more months before being formally crowned as King and Queen of England.

11.3 English Bill of Rights

A bitterly divided English Convention Parliament convened in January 1689 to transfer the thrones of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Radical Whigs thought that William ought to rule as an elected monarch, which would mean that his authority would come from the people. Mary would have served as William's regent if the Tories had their way. William threatened to leave England if he was not given the throne, so Parliament came to an agreement on a dual monarchy with William III as the head of state and Mary II, James' daughter, as the queen.

William and Mary were compelled to sign "An Act Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and Settling the Succession of the Crown" as part of the compromise arrangement with Parliament. The act, also referred to as the English Bill of Rights, defined the civil and constitutional rights of the populace and granted Parliament far more control over the monarchy. William III and Mary II both signed the English Bill of Rights in February 1689, demonstrating that they were more ready than any previous king or queen to submit to parliamentary restraints. The English Bill of Rights recognized, among other constitutional principles, the right to regular sessions of Parliaments, free elections, and freedom of speech in Parliament. It also

forbade the monarchy from ever coming under Catholic rule, speaking to the core of the Glorious Revolution. Many historians today concur that England's transition from an absolute to a constitutional monarchy began with the English Bill of Rights.

11.4 Nature of the Revolution

Numerous names have been given to the 1688 Revolution, including glorious, bloodless, reluctant, accidental, popular, and the list goes on. It is simple to understand why such a significant moment in the history of Britain is accompanied by so many superlatives. Its legacy continues in many ways. For instance, the removal of the Stuarts, particularly James, led to the emergence of people who are still devoted to the ideals of Stuart kings in Scotland till date. These people continue to toast The Young Pretender, Bonnie Prince Charlie, the successor of James II.

For historians, the Revolution of 1688 initially appeared to be an unsolvable problem. The so-called Whig view of the Revolution predominated for almost three hundred years, maintains Schwoerer in the preface of 'The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives'. This interpretation of the events of 1688 was so prevalent that it initially seemed as though more research was not necessary. Modern historians have, however, refuted that viewpoint in recent years. Their findings have not only overturned the conventional wisdom of the Revolution but have also sparked fresh debates regarding its very nature and historical significance for Britain. The Whigs, a political party that came to power following the Settlement of 1689, took over the interpretation of the Revolution after 1688-1689, and David Hume produced the first official account of the events of 1688 from their perspective in 1778. Hume begins his account of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 by denying James II's right to rule over England, Scotland, and Ireland. The majority of the country, according to him, believed that James was capable of committing any crime out of bigotry since they had witnessed how, out of similar motivations, he had committed every imprudence. In contrast, William of Orange is portrayed as a selfless prince who was solely concerned with liberating England from the oppression it had fallen victim to and had no idea that his activities would one day lead to the offer of the English throne. Hume claimed that William of Orange stood up to James II's religious intolerance for the

greater good of England. Hume's writings shaped the personalities of the two main political figures of the day. The political agreement, according to Hume, also resolved every issue that had divided the king and Parliament, and as a result, "the powers of royal prerogative were more narrowly confined and more precisely defined, than in any previous time of the English government." The events of 1688—the nation's deliverance from a despotic king and the construction of a more just system of government—are widely regarded as a significant turning point in English political history thanks in large part to Hume's efforts.

In the middle of the nineteenth century, the great Whig historian Thomas Babington Macaulay gave the Whig interpretation of events its most identifiable and distinct shape. Many of the issues from Hume's earlier history are continued in Macaulay's 'The History of England from the Accession of James the Second'. William of Orange, "whom God had made the glorious instrument of liberating the nation from superstition and oppression," is the country's saviour, while James II is Macaulay's villain. By asserting that Parliament had resolved to "establish the ancient rights and freedoms of England," Macaulay takes his theory a step further. The Glorious Revolution reestablished the "limited monarchy of the thirteenth century," according to which the king was unable to take any action without "the approval of the representatives of the nation." The Declaration of Rights, according to Macaulay, "had made nothing law which had not already been law," and it served as the foundation for all admirable laws enacted since 1689 as well as for any laws that might be enacted in the future. The Glorious Revolution, in Macaulay's opinion, was the key development in English history. It eliminated prejudice and superstition, which were embodied in James II's brutal rule, and replaced them with a traditional system of English government in which the king's authority was constrained by Parliament. Macaulay saw the Revolution as a conflict between virtue and evil represented by the Whig and Tory political parties, according to W.A. Speck in the introduction to 'Reluctant Revolutionaries'. The Whigs, who supported "the rule of law, a balanced constitution, the crucial role of parliament, and the necessity of religious toleration," finally prevailed. Macaulay viewed the Tories as the antagonists of his tale because they supported absolutism and "divine, indefeasible, hereditary right." According to Macaulay, this victory was unquestionably positive since it finally assured that Parliament would win the power struggle that had occurred

between the Stuart kings and Parliament. The Whigs' victory in the political settlement of 1689 made this victory possible. For many years, the Whig account of the events of 1688–1689 was recognised as the final word on the Glorious Revolution. This was the official position of Parliament even in the years leading up to the 1988 tercentenary of the Glorious Revolution, as evidenced by the pamphlets produced by Her Majesty's Government for the occasion. The Glorious Revolution "destroyed the last remnants of the Crown's financial independence and confirmed the authority of Parliament," according to the booklet's conclusion. Some of the conclusions of the Whig version should still be considered even though they have been rightfully contested in recent years. The Glorious Revolution did alter England's political landscape and significantly impacted the country's standing in the international arena. Of course, the substance of that transition is much more nuanced than the Whig history would imply. A situation not dissimilar to that of the relationship between Parliament and the king prior to 1688 was when the king adopted policies that Parliament disagreed with.

Up until the 20th century, there were several versions of history outside the Whig history. Edmund Burke's book 'Reflections on the Revolution' in France presented the first significant argument against the Revolution's historical significance. While some say that England got the ability to choose its own government from the Revolution settlement, it did not do so for all, claims Burke, writing in opposition to the French revolution and attempting to disassociate England from the events on the continent. This new, previously unheard-of list of rights, he claims, "belongs to those gentlemen and their faction alone, while being made in the name of the entire nation." The majority of English citizens had no ownership interest in it. Burke contends that the Declaration of Rights is a declaration "declaring the rights and liberties of the subject" and does not address the right of Englishmen to elect their own rulers or establish their own government. Burke downplays the Revolution and its effects on the English polity, viewing it as little more than a blip on the succession radar because James II's removal was necessary to protect the nation from tyranny. Burke believed that the Revolution had little significance and was therefore unworthy of comparison with the contemporary Revolution raging through France.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century and up until the present, Marxist historians likewise adopted this minimization of the Revolution of 1688. According

to historians like Christopher Hill, the events of 1640 were a true revolution in English politics since they ended "established patriarchal connections between landlords and tenants." The English bourgeois class began to emerge in the 1640s, challenging the traditional elites for control and approval. "The coup d'état of 1688-89" was an indicator of the changed power dynamics of England. Hill and other Marxists disregard the events of 1688 as having no bearing on English politics. According to their account of events, the Civil Wars of 1640 marked the start of the genuine revolution, and the settlement of 1689 accepted its outcomes as historical truth.

In the years leading up to the tercentenary in 1988, the Whig version of events started to come under intense scrutiny. In his biography of William III of Orange, Stephen Baxter makes the case that William's deeds were not solely for England's benefit. "[William] interfered, not for himself or for his wife, but for his faith and for the defence of his own land, the United Provinces," the author claims. Additionally, according to Baxter, William III had significantly more power than the English Parliament in the months immediately following the invasion because "in December of 1688 he might have had anything he wanted." In this interpretation, William is seen as a victorious conqueror who gave Parliament the freedom to set its own terms for capitulation while making sure that no one could accuse William of forcing Parliament, as opposed to Parliament setting the terms. William III, as portrayed by Baxter, is a cunning politician who comes off as more relatable than the altruistic hero of Macaulay's history.

The myth of the 1688 Revolution was chipped at in the years leading up to the tercentenary by other histories. According to J. H. Plumb, Parliament was the "key to political instability" since the king failed to effectively control it. Due to this, there is a possibility of political anarchy when the legislature is unchecked and the exchequer is empty. The occurrences of 1688–1689 marked the beginning of the process of parliamentary control, which eliminated its innate volatility and provided Parliament with the framework it required to function. Through Plumbs' arguments, we are able to see a Parliament that is riven with instability and in desperate need of reform and control in order to operate smoothly and effectively rather than the virtually omniscient Parliament of the Whig tradition. Only after the events of 1688,

which caused England to get involved in conflicts abroad and change into the power of Great Britain, was this efficiency attained. The Revolution was being thoroughly reexamined by historians 300 years after it occurred in 1688, and one of the first to write in time for the tercentenary was W.A. Speck. His book's title, 'Reluctant Revolutionaries', does a fantastic job of summarising his argument. While James II's acts and restrictions disturbed England, according to Speck, it was not a nation that would have uprised against him in 1688. He emphasises that the later Stuarts came very close to building an absolutist state in England, but that James II's conversion to Catholicism destroyed the support the Crown had received under Charles II and resulted in James' people' widespread unhappiness. Even then, the majority of English people had a passive role in the events of 1688, allowing William to succeed in his invasion; as Speck argues, "In 1685, [James'] subjects' devotion contributed to the king's successful crushing of [Monmouth's] insurrection." In 1688, his subjects' alienation aided the cause of the Revolution.' According to Speck, while the 1689 settlement meant that Parliament became an institution rather than an event, it is difficult to argue that it created a superior form of governance or secured human liberty. Speck writes, "In 1688, there was not much glory." However, a revolution occurred. Many of the Whigs' former claims about the Revolution were thoroughly exposed and refuted by Speck's argument and analysis, which also rejected the Marxist account of what happened. Even though Speck minimised the significance of the events of 1688, he correctly concludes that it was a revolution. Determining the type of revolution that took place in 1688 is a challenge and the reason for its ongoing fascination.

In 1988, there were various conferences and symposiums conducted to study the events of 1688 and their impact on the United Kingdom. The discussions at these meetings encompassed every aspect of the Revolution, from the meaning of the name to a broader view of where the Revolution actually took place. Lois Schwoerer wrote that, in regards to the term Glorious Revolution, 'People who used the epithet revealed how myopic and narrow was their perspective, for obviously "Glorious Revolution: could apply only to England, not to Scotland or Ireland.' This is particularly true for Ireland where the Catholic majority rallied to James II in 1689 only to face a crushing defeat under William III that ensured that Ireland would be ruled by a Protestant minority. K.H.D. Haley opined that William's invasion of

England would not have been successful if he had not won the support from the Dutch States-General. This argument thereby added support to the argument that William's actions in 1688 were in some aspect a foreign invasion. John C. Rule extended the international element of the Revolution of 1688 to a discussion regarding why Louis XIV did seemingly nothing to help his potential ally, James II, ward off William III. These new arguments highlight that historians were finally asking in-depth and complex questions about the Revolution ignored by the Whig historians. There was definitely an implication of the broadening the impact of the Revolution beyond England to the whole of the British Isles and Europe.

These were important steps taken in beginning to truly understand what had happened in 1688 and there were a number of conclusions that many of these historians all seemed to reach. The majority of people appear to concur that the Revolution settlement did change the English Polity. Jones describes William III's dismay when Parliament overrode his objections and compelled the army's disbandment at the conclusion of the war that soon followed the Revolution. The Revolution, according to Jones, "did lead to a transformation in the way government was administered," the king and his ministers were subject to the law, and "the executive became dependent on the active cooperation of Parliament and the political nation. Power had shifted from the king to the king in Parliament, a hybrid institution that provided the political elite with a way to successfully oppose royal policies or the king with a stage to win resounding public support for his initiatives. For the British political system, this was a significant mile The Glorious Revolution of 1688 is now commonly understood according to these new concepts, although unlike past decades, study has not stagnated since 1988. The Kingdoms of Scotland and Ireland have been included in recent work that updates the historical narrative of the Glorious Revolution. 'The Revolution of 1688-1689' had an introduction by Lois Schwoerer which made mention of this new development, and articles started to appear more frequently around the tercentenary. However, Tim Harris' book 'Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720' provided the first in-depth analysis of the Glorious Revolution outside of England. In his work, Harris emphasises how James' activities in both Scotland and Ireland raised significant concerns for the English polity, particularly in light of his claims of religious toleration. The Revolution was undoubtedly not glorious for Ireland, where the

conflict between James and William resulted in a harsh penal code for the country's preponderance of Catholics, and Scotland ultimately lost its political independence in the decades that followed. The exclusion of Scotland and Ireland, according to Harris' introduction, "has helped perpetuate an image of the Glorious Revolution as a rather tame affair." Understanding the Glorious Revolution's events, which saw England become the dominating power in the British Isles, requires the inclusion of Scotland and Ireland. This shows that the Glorious Revolution was more complex than many historians are ready to acknowledge. William succeeded to the thrones of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and while though the Revolutionary settlement was mostly the work of English politicians, it was intended to cover all three countries. The most nuanced and accurate depiction of the Glorious Revolution's triumphs and the significant cost to the people of the British Isles is provided by this three kingdoms theory.

11.5 Conclusion

The Revolution had a negative political and social impact on English Catholics. Catholics were prohibited from voting, holding elected office, or holding commissioned military positions for more than a century. The current queen of England was not permitted to practise Catholicism or wed a Catholic until 2015. The era of English parliamentary democracy was inaugurated by the English Bill of Rights in 1689. Since its adoption, no English monarch or queen has possessed total political authority.

The Glorious Revolution had a tremendous impact on American history as well. The harsh rules that Catholic King James II had placed on the Protestant Puritans residing in the American colonies were removed by the Revolution. The American colonists' ambitions for independence were stoked by news of the Revolution, which sparked a number of uprisings and protests against English rule.

The Glorious Revolution provided the foundation for constitutional law that established and defined political authority as well as the granting and limiting of rights, which is perhaps most significant. These guidelines for the allocation of duties and responsibilities among clearly defined executive. The constitutions of England,

the United States, and many other Western nations all have legislative and judicial departments of government.

11.6 Model Questions

1. Discuss the background of the Glorious Revolution.
2. Discuss briefly the nature of the Glorious Revolution.
3. Write a short note on the Bill of Rights.

11.7 Suggested Readings

Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660–1685*, Penguin Books, 2006.

Schwoerer, Lois G. (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Speck, W.A. *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1988.

Unit 12 ❑ Consequences

Structure

12.0 Objectives

12.1 Introduction

12.2 Political Consequences of the Revolution

12.2.1 Parliament and Revolution: Effects

12.3 Revolution Settlement in Scotland and Ireland

12.4 Change in British Foreign and Economic Policy

12.5 Conclusion

12.6 Model Questions

12.7 Suggested Readings

12.0 Objectives

The unit will enquire about the effects and nature of the Glorious Revolution of 1688. How far it will be correct to mark the revolution as a glorious one is the chief question to be enquired on here.

12.1 Introduction

The year 1688 can be regarded as a benchmark in the history of England. This year witnessed a revolution of great significance without shedding a drop of blood. With William's landing in England and James II's flight to France this huge political change came about. It is generally known as the Glorious Revolution. For most Englishmen this Revolution was indeed a 'glorious' one. In this chapter we will try to enquire how far 'glorious' was the Glorious Revolution.

12.2 Political Consequences of the Revolution

The essential 'glory' of the British Revolution resided in the fact that it was bloodless, that there was no civil war, massacre, or proscription, and, above all, that theological and political disputes that had long and passionately split persons and parties were settled by accord. The 1689 settlement endured the test of time.

The continental revolutions took place in the 18th and 19th centuries where all traces of limited monarchy of the middle ages had long been effaced. The right of the prince to make laws and to levy money, had during many generations been undisputed. It was risky to criticise his government even in the mildest of terms. There was not a single institution left that could provide defence against the tyranny of the Princes, and his subjects kept their personal liberty only under his pleasure. In light of this, the English Revolution of 1688, which eliminated the idea of royal prerogatives and freed the fundamental rules of the realm of ambiguity, was undoubtedly a glorious event. The fact that it was completed without any violence and that it marked the start of a new period in English history based on all the best constitutional ideas that England had been building since the 13th century added to its glory. This Revolution was also glorious because it quietly buried the divine rights of kings and made accession to the throne essentially dependent on an act of Parliament. The fact that the Revolution of 1688 was the final English Revolution is the highest tribute that can be paid to its greatness. The English populace had never before organised resistance to the ruling class. The Crown's prerogatives were converted into Parliament's rights starting at this point. The last attempt in English history to establish the divine right of Kings failed with the overthrow of James II. James II's abdication marked the end of the divine prerogative of Kings in England. The new monarchs, who owed the Parliament their throne, had to swear an oath to rule in accordance with its recommendations.

12.2.1 Parliament and Revolution: Effects

Because there was no king to issue writs for a normal Parliament after the arrival of William of Orange and the departure of James II, it became essential to summon a Convention Parliament identical to that which had been summoned by Charles II.

Initially, Tory members supported designating William and Mary regents in the absence of a legitimate king. However, when William spoke emphatically and threatened to return to Holland if no power beyond that of Regent was granted to him, the assembly was forced to approve a resolution declaring James II's monarchy vacant since he had broken the fundamental compact between king and people.

The crown was then offered to Mary alone, who refused to accept until it was jointly offered and her husband was given a fair part. The convention also obliged Mary, and both were considered as joint Sovereigns with equal powers on the condition that they ratified a "declaration of rights," a statement enumerating and declaring illegal James II's transgressions. Despite the fact that William and Mary were named joint sovereigns, governance was solely in William's hands. Both accepted the monarchy on the terms presented and were formally proclaimed as William III and Mary II on February 13, 1989.

Parliament affirmed the authority to dethrone and install a monarch by deposing James II and elevating William and Mary to the throne. It was a final blow to the king's divine claims. After that, all authority was centralised in the Parliament, which was to steer the nation's policy going forward. Thus, law triumphed over prerogative. The groundwork was created for the cabinet system of government, which is now the way of life in England. "No pardon by crown could be argued to impeachment by the House of Commons-a clause which finally established the duty of the king's minister for all acts of states," Warner and Marten wrote, "No pardon by crown could be pleaded to impeachment by the House of Commons-a clause which final established the responsibility of the king's minister for all acts of states".

Since no changes to the electoral laws had been made since the middle of the fifteenth century, the population shift left popular cities unrepresented while towns with few inhabitants kept the power to elect members. This explained the presence of several pocket boroughs where a few remaining electors were swayed by huge landowners or wealthy merchants, as well as the rotten boroughs where votes could be bought. Thus, until the passage of the Great Reform Bill in 1832, the House of Commons was an unrepresentative parliament dominated by aristocratic influence. The Bill made no attempt to modify electoral rolls. There was no attempt to give

more share to people in whose name the revolution had taken place. Thus the Bill remained conservative.

Following William and Mary's accession to the throne, the convention, which had been transformed by the new sovereigns into a regular Parliament, proceeded to supplement the revolution settlement through a series of Parliamentary Acts, with the 'declaration of rights' which it had drawn up earlier being embodied in a formal state known as the Bill of Rights.

This text created the Third Great Charter of English Liberties, completing the work begun by the Magna Carta. It was noteworthy in many ways. First and foremost, it ultimately stripped the crown of all authority to levy taxes without the permission of Parliament. Parliament was now the last and ultimate power in imposing and lowering all taxes. The king now had no right to tax the people on his own. Parliament's supremacy was recognised. It also stripped the king of the authority to suspend laws passed by Parliament at his discretion. As a result, several royal prerogatives were abolished, and the king was forced to abdicate the people's authority. Second, it declared that the election of members to Parliament should be free, and that freedom of expression and discussion in Parliament should not be impeached or challenged in any court other than the Houses of Parliament. Thus, the member was accorded a basic Privilege of free expression in Parliament, which is still highly respected today. Third, it ruled that no sovereign who practised the Catholic faith or married a Catholic could be allowed to rule. In England, Protestantism was designated the state religion. Fourth, it requested regular Parliaments and established the subjects' right to petition the king. Finally, it made the formation or maintaining of a standing army within the kingdom in times of peace illegal without Parliamentary authorization. Despite widespread public opposition to standing armies, the interdependence and politics necessitated such an army, and Parliament was forced to approve funds for keeping soldiers.

The Mutiny Act, which authorised martial law penalties, allowed the crown the authority to maintain discipline. This act was only in effect for a year, therefore the king was required to assemble Parliament every year to renew it. The crown's revenue was reduced to a very minimal level, and Parliament resolved to provide annual grants while securing from the king the power to audit the royal finances. This

also assured annual sessions of Parliament, because the king could not obtain supplies unless Parliament was summoned every year. As a result, Parliament gained entire control over finance, as well as increased authority over administration.

Another Bill introduced in Parliament addressed the issue of religious freedom for dissenters. Even the most fanatical high Church adherents realised by this point that forcing the protestant was impossible. Dissenters are being welcomed back into the Anglican Church. Now that the government was led by a Calvinistic ruler, the issue of religious freedom could no longer be disregarded. However, the High Church group was unwilling to widen the Church's base in order to welcome moderate dissenters. After great debate, the Toleration Act was approved, granting protestant dissenters who embraced the concepts of the Trinity freedom of worship. It granted advantages to Roman Catholics, Jews, and Unitarians. It also did not allow a non-conformist to take office for the Test and Corporation Acts. Nonetheless, despite its substantial rewards, this Act represents the beginning of religious tolerance in England. According to Warner and Marten, "the Toleration Act constituted a significant advance, and since that time, the sentiment of tolerance has continuously increased."

12.3 Revolution Settlement in Scotland and Ireland

The revolution settlement in Scotland and Ireland was not as calm as in England. The vast majority of Scots agreed William III was their leader, but the Highlanders of the North and West of Scotland who rose up under him were slaughtered.

In Ireland, the opposition to William's rule was much stronger. They sided with James II and recruited an army on his behalf, as did the majority of Irish Roman Catholics. After learning of the intensity of this backing, James decided to travel to Ireland himself to reclaim his kingdom. William also visited Ireland in 1690.

At the Battle of the Boyne, his forces dispersed the Irish army, compelling James to retreat in haste and board a ship bound for France. Finally, the Irish agreed on the assurance that Roman Catholics would be allowed to worship freely as they had been during the reign of Charles II. The English Government, however, did not keep the promise. Irish Catholics were excluded government offices only a year later and they had to suffer other restrictions and harassments.

12.4 Change in British Foreign and Economic Policy

Furthermore, the Glorious Revolution resulted in a significant shift in British foreign policy. Despite the fact that the English had been vehemently opposed to the French, his predecessors James II and Charles II had maintained cordial relations with the French crown.

For a while, the relationship between two dynasties resulted in France dominating British foreign policy. However, under the new monarch, England once again became France's main opponent. When William was promised the throne of England, France and the Netherlands were engaged in a regular war.

It was only inevitable that William would not rest until French power was utterly smashed. England confronted the difficulty of maintaining Europe's balance of power by opposing Louis XIV's ambitions to gain for France what he saw as its natural borders. Thus, William's accession not only ended absolute monarchy in England, but also changed British foreign policy.

It marked the start of a series of wars between England and France that would last more than a century. The English struggle was initially fought for balance of power in Europe, but it later evolved into a war for colonial and commercial domination.

War was a serious concern. At the time of his deposition, James II was preparing for war with the Dutch. The war was caused by a combination of factors. The Dutch posed a challenge to James II. The United Provinces of the Netherlands had been formed by rebelling against the Spanish ruler and had since grown to be extremely affluent. Both James II and Louis XIV, both absolutist kings, saw a successful republic as an unpleasant model for their own subjects. The Dutch readiness to house English dissidents (particularly John Locke), publish pamphlets critical of the English government for distribution in England, and intervene in English internal matters further enraged James II.

However, one key aspect was that the Dutch posed a threat to the English economy. Trade was the cornerstone of both the English and Dutch success, and they competed in both India and the spice islands. If trade was restricted (as Child believed), every Dutch gain resulted in an English loss. Furthermore, both the

English and the Dutch appeared to believe that dominating foreign lands was critical to their success. They'd fought wars at sea, and they were still fighting passionately and bloodily over the spice islands. The opponent was the Netherlands, and France was a natural ally.

During the Glorious Revolution, an enemy became an ally, and an ally became an enemy. Only a month after William III's accession to the throne was war proclaimed against France. Louis XIV seemed determined to rule all of Europe, making France a constant danger to the geographical integrity of all other European nations. France was likewise striving to expand New France at the expense of the Hudson's Bay Company and the American colonies, and France was accused of undermining England's trade. The Dutch were now portrayed as a nation whose wealth was due to their own hard work, and whose understanding of a citizen's rights and liberties was similar to that of the English.

The tax structure was altered to reflect the new idea of property and prosperity. Under Charles II, Parliament established a hearth tax. Because fire and heating were critical components of many production processes, the burden of this levy fell disproportionately on manufacturers. Recognizing manufacturing and trade as the sources of the country's wealth, the new Parliament abolished the hearth tax. It substituted that tax with a land tax, reversing Child's chosen tax policy. Concerned that the increasing number of textile imports from India was harming English manufacturers, Parliament imposed duties on East Indian textiles.

Another significant development was the establishment of the Bank of England, which was initially an organisation that collected deposits, paid interest, and, most significantly, offered loans to manufacturers and dealers. Its principal function was to supply liquidity to England's burgeoning economy, but another duty was always in the works. Warfare technology was evolving, making it more expensive (here). The English government could not fund its war against France with current receipts, so it borrowed from the Bank of England. England's success in its wars against France was due, at least in part, to its "deeper wallets." During the Glorious Revolution, one economic philosophy rose and another fell, a transition that was vividly represented in England's economic policies.

12.5 Conclusion

An examination of the consequences will perhaps prove that it will not be incorrect to mark the revolution of 1688 as a 'glorious' one. The changes in Britain were far-reaching with beneficial consequences in most cases whether political or economic. Above all, the Revolution of 1688 proved that the real sovereign power belongs to the people, not to the king. After the revolution the king became only the titular head of the state.

12.6 Model Questions

1. What were the political consequences of the Revolution of 1688?
2. How did the Parliament establish its supremacy in England?
3. How did the settlements of Scotland and Ireland impact the polity of the regions?
4. How did the British foreign policy change after 1688.
5. What was the impact on trade as a result of the revolution?

12.7 Suggested Readings

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe In Transition: From Feudalism to Industrialization*, New Delhi, 2013.

Chaudhuri, K.C. *British History*, Calcutta, 1971.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Schwoerer, Lois G. (ed.) *The Revolution of 1688-1689: Changing Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Unit 13 ❑ Intellectual and Cultural Trends

Structure

13.0 Objectives

13.1 Introduction

13.2 Restoration in Literature

13.3 Philosophical Context

13.4 Development in Literature

13.5 Poetry

13.6 Prose

13.7 Restoration Theatre

13.8 Conclusion

13.9 Model Questions

13.10 Suggested Readings

13.0 Objectives

The unit will enquire on the reflection of the English revolution in literature and other cultural sections. It will mainly focus on the Restoration era which brought about remarkable changes in the intellectual and cultural trends in English history.

13.1 Introduction

The way that literature responds to and is necessarily impacted by the political context in which it is written is one of the most significant and fascinating aspects of literature. The Restoration era, which spanned from approximately 1660 to 1688, contains some of the best instances of this. The term “restoration” derives from Charles II’s coronation, which symbolises the return of the traditional English monarchical form of governance after a brief period under the control of a few republican governments.

13.2 Restoration in Literature

The Restoration Period in English Literature saw the rise of journalism, poetry written in heroic couplets, and a raw, sexually-charged kind of theatre known as "restoration comedy." The foundation of literary writing is the attempt to come to terms with the political events of prior decades. The literature written during the Restoration era was both unique and broad, covering a wide spectrum of topics and literary genres, from openly religious to caustic and risqué. Many academics consider James II, the brother of Charles II, abdicating in 1688 to be the literary end of the Restoration era.

13.3 Philosophical Context

The Enlightenment began about at the same time as the Restoration era and was so named because it continued until the end of the 18th century. Modern science, which sees the natural world as a subject that can be known and tested, was developed in part because of the Enlightenment's emphasis on reason and logic. It's important to acknowledge the respect for human reason that underlies much Restoration literature, despite the Enlightenment's enormous influence on the Restoration era. Many Restoration writers believed that those who ardently followed their philosophy were to blame for the changes in their government and the violence that accompanied them. In this way, the English political events illuminate the cynicism that permeates Restoration literature.

13.4 Development in Literature

The Earl of Rochester's 'Sodom' and John Milton's 'Paradise Lost' are both examples of extremes in restoration literature, as are high-spirited sexual comedy of 'The Country Wife' and the moral insight of 'The Pilgrim's Progress'. It witnessed the publication of Locke's 'Treatises of Government', the establishment of the Royal Society, Robert Boyle's mystical explorations and fanatical attacks on theatre, as well as the development of literary criticism by John Dryden and John Dennis. During this

time, the essay evolved into a periodical art form, news became a commodity, and textual criticism started. Convention dictates that the dates for Restoration literature vary significantly depending on the genre. As a result, the "Restoration" in drama may last until 1700, whereas it might only last in poetry until 1666 (see 1666 in poetry); in prose, it might end in 1688 due to the rising tensions over succession and the corresponding rise in journalism and periodicals; or it might not end until 1700, when those periodicals became more stable. The literature that started and flourished under Charles II is generally referred to as the "Restoration," whether it was the laudatory ode that found new life with restored aristocracy, the eschatological literature that revealed growing despair among Puritans, or the literature of growing trade and communication which was a result of England's mercantile empire.

13.5 Poetry

Poetry flourished during the Restoration. Poems influenced political events and accurately captured the times, making them not only the most widely read type of literature but also the most important. To its own citizens, it was a time when only the king, not any one particular genius, was in charge. The lyric, ariel, historical, and epic poems were being developed at the time. The poetry of the restoration tended to be caustic, realistic, and heroic couplet-based, of which Dryden was the foremost master. He was a key player in the Restoration Era. He also wrote plays and prose pieces. Because of this, the Restoration Age is also known as the "Age of Dryden."

Rationale was another essential element of Restoration poetry. It was influenced by various scientific advancements of the day rather than relying on metaphysical concepts, which were the foundation of the majority of earlier poetries. These scientific advancements inspired the people of Britain to approach challenges rationally.

The two significant achievements made during the Restoration Era in English Literature are Realism and Preciseness. The focus of the writers was on creating a true reflection of the existing corruption in their society. English authors made an effort to develop a writing and speaking style that was closest to the way people actually communicated. Additionally, they ceased using Latin phrases and classical

allusions, among other things. Since it emphasizes accuracy or sparing word use, restoration poetry is seen as moderate. The Restoration school of poetry, often known as the classical school of poetry, dominated English literature for more than a century thanks to its three main characteristics: moderation, realism, and reason.

In essence, satire flourished during the Restoration Age. The Restoration Era was an era of satire due to the major influences of the day. In the society of the time, passing judgement and making criticisms were commonplace, and this practise inevitably gave rise to satire. Restoration poets made it their responsibility and joy to publicly refute erroneous spiritual authority. A long time ago, satirists were respected. Restoration poets were inspired to produce satires by the study of such satirists. Moreover, due to the French influence satire writing became very popular.

A mock-epic is a work of art that persistently mimics the ornate structure and ceremonial tone of an epic poem while using it to tell a story about a trivial subject. It uses themes that are well-known. As a result, humorous and insightful observations about modern culture, religion, and social issues are frequently made in mock-epic poetry. Mock-epic poetry mainly utilises the satirical approach, which entails using sarcasm, exaggeration, and criticism to make fun of the original subject, usually in an impressive way. 'The Rape of Lock' by Alexander Pope, the best of all the mock-epic or mock-heroic poems, is a notable example of an English mock-epic. The most influential person of the Restoration Era was John Dryden. Political satires, doctrinal poems, and the fables are the three main categories under which Dryden's poetry might be categorised. The poetry of Dryden is eminently emblematic of the Restoration Age and has all its traits. Another of the restoration era's most significant poets was Samuel Butler. 'Absolem' and 'Religio Laici' are two of his best-known compositions. 'Hudibras', a scathing parody on Puritanism that was successfully published in three parts, is his most well-known poem. It attained considerable popularity. Charles-II was so gratified with him that he gave the author a generous financial award.

13.6 Prose

Christian religious writing predominates in prose during the Restoration era, although fiction and journalism also saw their beginnings during this time and would

go on to become major literary genres. Political and economic writing frequently veered into religious writing, just as religious topics were suggested in or openly addressed in political and economic literature.

With the advent of the Restoration Age, English prose quickly transitioned to a strictly functional style. It eliminated any superfluous decoration. During this time, the turbulent antiquity gave way to the stability and balance of the modern era. The transformation was the result of a variety of intricate factors. 'The History of English Literature'. Although there has always been a critical interest in poetry, this interest in prose was only apparent now. The grammar and syntactic rules of English used to be dynamic before this. Many famous writers, including Dryden, advocated for the stabilisation of the English language throughout the Restoration Era. They indicated a wish to definitively rephrase and improve language. For the first time there were writers debating what is good and bad in history. Hobbes and the Royal Society served as the origin of their new interest. Clarity, simplicity, and utility are preferred over adornment, affection, turgidity, etc. in English writing written during the Restoration Era. The best illustration is found in Sprat's 'History of the Royal Society'.

English prose underwent a "de-Latinization" process throughout the Restoration diction (word choice) and grammar of English prose were heavily Latinized (structure of the sentence). The complexity of style is the product of this Latinization. After the Restoration Age, English prose underwent a de-Latinization process that resulted in its simplification and modernization. Additionally, it suggested that spoken and written languages will become more similar. Overall, it may be said that English prose advanced significantly from antiquity to contemporary.

The founding of the Royal Society in 1662 to further experimental science was one of the most significant influences on the growth of Restoration prose. Charles II gave his approval for the Society's founding. Even their own private laboratories were permitted for courtiers. The founding of the Royal Society resulted in significant developments that transformed English prose from antiquity to modernity. Scientists wanted to explain their experiments in language that was concise, emotionless, and almost mathematical. The Royal Society members' use of and advocacy for clear language had a significant impact on modern men of letters. As a result, the majority

of the renowned authors of the time adopted simplicity in language. For the clarity of the text, the age's diviners did just as well as its scientists. The outstanding sermons that were written during that time are legendary. Divines broke with tradition and delivered their sermons in clear, plain English that could be understood and appreciated by the average person. They had no interest in showy displays of affection or treating their listeners like empty vessels to be pumped into. English prose underwent a significant transformation as a result of Tillotson. One of the greatest artists of English writing, Dryden, said that Tillotson was the primary influence on his use of style. Last but not least, the popularisation of the literature at the close of the 17th century had a modernising effect on English writing. The growth of the readership is largely to blame for the English language's stabilisation and simplification. With an eye toward the average person, the writers naturally used basic, understandable language.

13.7 Restoration Theatre

A pivotal moment in the history of English theatre occurred in 1660, when the stage-struck Charles II was restored to power. After the previous Puritan regime's ban on public theatrical performances was overturned, the play immediately and abundantly reconstituted itself. The King's and the Duke's Company, two theatre companies, were founded in London, and two opulent playhouses with moveable scenery and thunder and lightning machines were constructed to Christopher Wren's designs. Scholars currently emphasize on the quick evolution of theatre in the period as well as the significance of the social and political circumstances shaping it. Traditionally, Restoration plays have been examined by genre rather than chronology, more or less as if they were all contemporary. The importance of the first professional actresses' appearance is recognized, as is the impact of theatre company competitiveness and playhouse economics.

Due to the production of 'Comedy of Manners', the Restoration era (1660–1700 AD) is considered one of the most glorious times in the history of English drama. In addition to the 'Comedy of Manners', the so-called 'Heroic Tragedy' also had a brief run, but it was too artificial and unnatural and only represented a type of French

soil. Heroic Drama was another name for Heroic Tragedy, but Dryden, who was a major proponent of Tragedy, preferred the term. These plays were initially composed in blank verse tragedy and afterwards in the classical model of the rhymed heroic couplet. Only a disaster could have happened here. The conflict between love and honour was the central theme of the heroic plays. The heroes and heroine were portrayed in great roles, and their conversation was bombastic and intricate, rhymed in 10-syllable couplets, and full of emotion. No counterpart to these speeches could be found today. The protagonists would exhibit remarkable nobility. The audience would be impressed by this. The show would raise questions and spark people's imaginations. A hero, a heroine, and a villain were present. The antagonist was a powerful figure. The plays were predominately written for men starting in 1660, but in the 1670s and 1680s, the emphasis moved from the hero to the heroine. The heroic play flourished for around 20 years before dying naturally from exhaustion. Dramatic tragedies are primarily written by Dryden. One of the better heroic tragedies is 'The Conquest of Granada', but 'All for Love' is Dryden's best work. Nathaniel Lee and Thomas Otway were two other dramatist playwrights.

13.8 Conclusion

The era of restoration and revolution in England witnessed an overall change in the intellectual and cultural patterns of English life. The changed culture is chiefly reflected in contemporary poetry, prose and theatre as discussed above. The legacy of the restoration era produced some of the greatest pieces of English literature and theatre and stood the test of time.

13.9 Model Questions

1. Discuss the reflection of the Restoration era in English poetry.
2. Why is the Restoration era referred to as 'Age of Dryden'?
3. What were the major developments in prose in this period?
4. Discuss the development of theatrical art in the revolution era.

13.10 Suggested Readings

Hammond, Paul. *The Making of Restoration Poetry, Studies in Renaissance Literature*, Vol. 16, D.S. Brewer, 2006.

Wright, Gillian. *The Restoration Transposed: Poetry, Place and History, 1660-1700*, Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Mish, Charles C. (ed.). *Restoration Prose Fiction, 1660-1700: An Anthology of Representative Pieces*, University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

McMillin, Scott. *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Comedy*, W.W.Norton & Company, 1997.

Owen, Susan J. *Restoration Theatre and Crisis*, Oxford, OUP, 1996.

Module III: Rise of modern science in relation to European society from the Renaissance to the 17th century

Unit 14 ❑ Origins

Structure

14.0 Objectives

14.1 Introduction

14.2 The Classical Era

14.3 The Materialists, Pythagoreans and Socratic Scholars

14.4 Hellenistic Science

14.5 Roman Period

14.6 Medieval Period – Darkness or Continuity

14.7 Conclusion

14.8 Model Questions

14.9 Suggested Readings

14.0 Objectives

The unit will help the learners to:

- Understand the roots of scientific revolution which can be discovered from classical antiquity to the medieval era.
- Build a clear concept of the background history of present-day scientific knowledge system.

14.1 Introduction

We are now living in the age of science and technology. But this epoch had not started suddenly. There is a long history is behind it. It can be said that the present-day knowledge system is the collective contribution of some curious minded scholars' experiment based on academic activities done during the early modern period. The so-called scientific researches of the pre modern period was not alike the present system. Most of the researches were greatly influenced by many medieval prejudices and religious explanations. But still this was the threshold of an epoch characterized by modern science and technology. In this chapter we will try to enquire the origin of the scientific revolution. Primarily the chapter can be taken as the background of the scientific revolution.

14.2 The Classical Era

The root of the scientific revolution knowledge system can be found in classical antiquity. Classical antiquity is generally regarded as the period between the 8th century BCE and the 6th century CE centred on the Mediterranean Sea, comprising the interlocking civilizations of ancient Greece and ancient Rome known as the Greco-Roman world. The Greco-Roman world includes both ancient Greece and Rome. It was a time when both Greek and Roman societies were at their height and had a significant impact on most of Europe, Northern Africa, and Western Asia. It is the period in which both Greek and Roman societies flourished and wielded huge influence throughout much of Europe, Northern Africa, and Western Asia. Unlike present day, science was not recognised as a separate academic discipline in the classical antiquity. The entire knowledge system came under philosophy at that time. But the classical method encompassed inquiries into the workings of the world or universe aimed at both practical goals like establishing a reliable calendar or determining how to cure a variety of illnesses as well as more abstract investigations belonging to natural philosophy. The ideas regarding nature that were theorized during this period were not limited to natural science but included myths as well as religion.

Philosophers like Hippocrates, Aristotle, Euclid, Archimedes, Hipparchus, Galen and Ptolemy had great contributions in the world of academia. They helped to establish modern science by spreading their ideas and commentary throughout the Eastern, Islamic, and Latin civilizations. Their writings spanned a wide range of subjects, including physics, cosmology, and mathematics.

14.3 The Materialists, Pythagoreans and Socratic Scholars

"How did the ordered cosmos in which we live come to be?"–This was the most important curiosity responsible behind every early scientific approach. All the ancient religious texts had their own explanation. These texts explained this origin theory by incorporating God and other divine elements. First alternative or better to say non-religious scientific notion towards the origin theory came from the pre-Socratic materialists. Their explanations tended to center on the material source of things. Early materialist scholar Anaximander suggested that things could not come from a specific substance like water but rather from something he called the "boundless." Exactly what he meant is uncertain but it has been suggested that it was boundless in its quantity, so that creation would not fail; in its qualities, so that it would not be overpowered by its contrary; in time, as it has no beginning or end; and in space, as it encompasses all things. Later his followers returned to a concrete material substance, air, which could be altered by rarefaction and condensation. They adduced common observations to demonstrate that air was a substance and a simple experiment they used i.e. breathing on one's hand to show that it could be altered by rarefaction and condensation.

Later Heraclitus of Ephesus maintained that change, rather than any substance was fundamental, although the element fire seemed to play a central role in this process. Finally, Empedocles of Acragas seems to have combined the views of his predecessors, asserting that there are four elements (Earth, Water, Air and Fire) which produce change by mixing and separating under the influence of two opposing "forces" that he calls Love and Strife.

All these theories imply that matter is a continuous substance. Two Greek philosophers, Leucippus and Democritus of Abdera, who lived about 410 BCE, came up with the notion that there were two real entities: atoms, which were small

indivisible particles of matter, and the void, which was the empty space in which matter was located. Although matter is mentioned in every explanation from Thales to Democritus, what is more significant is that these competing explanations imply a continuous process of debate in which alternative theories were presented and contested.

The materialist explanation of the origin of the cosmos was very important no doubt. But it was not a perfect explanation. One important point was missing. It does not make much sense to think that an ordered universe comes out of a random collection of matter without having the existence of any ordering principle.

An alternative explanation to solve the limitations of the materialists came from the followers of the Pythagoras. They identified for the first time that number is the fundamental unchanging entity underlying all the structure of the universe. For them matter is made up of ordered arrangements of point or atoms. It is arranged according to geometrical principles into triangles, squares, rectangles etc. The components of the universe were organised according to mathematical and musical scale principles, even on a bigger scale. Number was thus emerging with the Pythagoreans as the logical foundation for an organised universe. This may be regarded as the first proposal for a scientific ordering principle of the cosmos and the first complete separation from religious explanations.

The Socratic philosophers also went with the Pythagoreans and found the ordering principle of the universe in mathematics or more specifically in geometry. But they were more popular for their contributions to the philosophical basis of scientific method than to any particular scientific concept. For them all things in the material world are imperfect reflections of eternal unchanging ideas similar to mathematical diagrams which are reflections of eternal unchanging mathematical truth.

14.4 Hellenistic Science

The classical antiquity had reached in its zenith during the Hellenistic period. With the military expeditions of Alexander the Great, the Greek culture spread over a large area containing varied cultures. Thus the period witnessed a cultural exchange with the east. The city of Alexandria became a major centre of scientific research in

the 3rd century BCE. In their scientific inquiries, Hellenistic scholars frequently used the ideas established in previous Greek thought, such as the intentional gathering of actual data or the application of mathematics to events. But opinions about Hellenistic science are very diverse.

Mathematics and astronomy reached its zenith during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, and much of the work represented by scholars such as Euclid, Archimedes, Apollonius, Hipparchus, and Ptolemy was of a very advanced level. Evidence of combining mathematical knowledge with technical or practical applications is also available. Antikythera mechanism may be the best example of this applied scientific knowledge. It is an analogue computer. Not only is that, the accurate measurement for the circumference of the Earth by Eratosthenes, or the mechanical works done by Hero also good examples of their technical advances.

Several Hellenistic centres of learning appeared during this period, of which the most important one was the Museum in Alexandria, Egypt, which attracted scholars from across the Hellenistic world mostly Greek, but also Egyptian, Jewish, Persian, Phoenician and even Indian scholars. Hellenistic mathematicians actively corresponded with one another despite their small numbers; sharing and copying one another's work among peers served as the primary form of publication. Most of the scientific texts written in Greek survived through the copying of manuscripts over the centuries, though some fragments dating from antiquity have been found across a large area including Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and Sicily.

14.5 Roman Period

Hellenistic era was particularly important for systemizing scientific knowledge. The Roman science was developed over the platform of this systematic knowledge. The scientific activities continued under the Roman rule were mostly explanations of Hellenic and Hellenistic science. Latin texts of Roman era were mainly compilations drawing on earlier Greek works. Greek remained the primary language used for cutting-edge scientific study and instruction. The few surviving Greek and Hellenistic works were developed and preserved later in the Byzantine Empire and the Islamic world. Late Roman attempts to translate Greek manuscripts into Latin were unsuccessful, and Western Europe did not get direct access to the majority of ancient

Greek texts until the 12th century. Pliny the elder and Ptolemy were the most prominent scholars of the Roman era. Pliny wrote '*Naturalis Historia'* around 77 CE. This book included his scientific observations of the natural world. Although there are several digressions in each section, Pliny's work is clearly separated into the domain of inorganic substance and the organic world of plants and animals. He is particularly interested in documenting the existence of plants, animals, and insects as well as how they are used (or abused) by humans. The most comprehensive collection of ancient writings currently extant, the description of metals and minerals is particularly thorough and useful. Although much of the work was compiled by judicious use of written sources, Pliny is especially significant because he provides full bibliographic details of the earlier authors and their works he uses and consults. Since Pliny's encyclopaedia survived the Dark Ages, even if the original texts themselves have disappeared, we know of these lost works. The book was one of the first to be printed in 1489, and became a standard reference work for Renaissance scholars, as well as an inspiration for the development of a scientific and rational approach to the world. On the other hand, Ptolemy's research programme involved a combination of theoretical analysis with empirical considerations seen, for instance, in his systematized study of astronomy. Ptolemy's '*Mathçmatikç Syntaxis'*, better known as the '*Almagest'*, sought to improve on the work of his predecessors by building astronomy upon a secure mathematical basis and also by demonstrating the relationship between astronomical observations and subsequent astronomical theory. Ptolemy, perhaps for pedagogic purposes, discusses in great detail physical representations of his mathematical models found in the Almagest in his '*Planetary Hypotheses'*. In a similar vein, the '*Geography'* was primarily concerned with creating precise maps using astronomical data. Apart from astronomy, both the '*Harmonics'* and the '*Optics'* contain instructions on how to construct and use experimental instruments to corroborate theory. Ptolemy's thoroughness and his preoccupation with ease of data presentation virtually guaranteed that earlier work on these subjects be neglected or considered obsolete, to the extent that almost nothing remains of the works Ptolemy often refers. His astronomical work in particular established the approach and area of study for centuries, and the Ptolemaic system rose to prominence as the standard representation of heavenly motions up until the sixteenth century.

14.6 Medieval Period–Darkness or Continuity

A common notion towards the explanation of medieval culture is to look upon it as a dark period. It is partially true that the scholarly activities were deeply influenced by the political unstable situation of Western Europe during the early and high medieval period. Particularly with the rise of the Roman Catholic Christianity, scientific activities were largely affected. A number of scholars migrated towards the east and took shelter in the Byzantine world. Thus, the east became the main centre of academia during the medieval period. The Byzantine scholars continued their studies and they were largely influenced by the Arabian and Oriental knowledge system. In this way a mixed approach towards the academia was built. Later with the rise of the Ottomans the eastern academia was again affected badly and a remigration towards the west took place. Most of the eastern scholars took shelter inside the various city-states of Italy like Florence, Venice, and Milan etc. This created the context of the birth of the renascent science which is commonly known as the scientific revolution.

14.7 Conclusion

The rediscovery of Greek scientific texts, both ancient and medieval, was accelerated as the Byzantine Empire fell to the Ottoman Turks and many Byzantine scholars sought refuge in the West, particularly Italy. Initially, there were no new developments in physics or astronomy, and the reverence for classical sources further enshrined the Aristotelian and Ptolemaic views of the universe. Renaissance philosophy lost much of its rigor as the rules of logic and deduction were seen as secondary to intuition and emotion. At the same time, Renaissance humanism stressed that nature came to be viewed as an animate spiritual creation that was not governed by laws or mathematics. Only later, when no more manuscripts could be found, did humanists turn from collecting to editing and translating them, and new scientific work began with the work of such figures as Copernicus, Cardano, and Vesalius.

Therefore, the late 14th and early 15th centuries was marked by a remarkable change in the scholarly world. Ancient and medieval Greek scientific works were

more readily rediscovered after the Byzantine Empire was conquered by the Ottoman Turks and many Byzantine scientists fled to the West, particularly Italy. The Aristotelian and Ptolemaic conceptions of the world were first further cemented by the regard for classical sources and the absence of fresh discoveries in physics or astronomy. Due to the perception that intuition and emotion were more important than the principles of logic and deduction, Renaissance philosophy lost much of its rigour. Renaissance humanism also emphasised how nature began to be seen as an active spiritual creation that was unconstrained by rules or mathematics. Humanists did not start editing and translating manuscripts until later, when no more manuscripts could be found. Finally, a new scientific approach began with the work of such great personalities as Copernicus, Cardano, and Vesalius.

14.8 Model Questions

1. Explain the origin of modern science.
2. Write a short note on medieval science.
3. In what way was Hellenistic science significant?
4. Discuss the scientific developments in Roman period.

14.9 Suggested Readings

Cohen, H. Floris. *The Rise of Modern Science Explained*: *A Comparative History*, Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Huff, Toby E. *The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China and the West,* Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Henry, John. *The Scientific Revolution and the Origins of Modern Science*, Bloomsbury Publishing, 2008.

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe in Transition*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Hall, A. *The Scientific Revolution, 1500-1800*, London, 1956.

Unit 15 ❑ Social Context of the Modern Science

Structure

15.0 Objectives

15.1 Introduction

15.2 A Changed World–Mechanical Universe

15.3 The Social Context of the Scientific Revolution

15.4 Factors Responsible for the Revolution

15.4.1 The Translation Movement in Europe

15.4.2 Renaissance Humanism

15.4.3 The Invention of the Printing Press

15.4.4 Discovery of the New World

15.5 The Meaning of the Scientific Revolution

15.6 Conclusion

15.7 Model Questions

15.8 Suggested Readings

15.0 Objectives

The unit will build a clear concept about:

- The growth and development of a mechanical universe.
- It will also analyse the factors that were responsible for creating a favourable context for the birth of modern science.

15.1 Introduction

Starting in the late fourteenth century, the cohesive medieval world began to disintegrate, a process that lasted to the late seventeenth century. Not only did basic medieval institutions like feudalism weaken but also the medieval view of the

universe, or world-view, faded and was gradually replaced by the modern, scientific understanding of nature. The Renaissance and Reformation, as well as the expansion of commercial affluence and state power, all contributed to the specific historical setting in which this shift took place. A key tenet of Western philosophy since the late seventeenth century, the mastery of nature was increasingly seen by literate elites in early modern Europe as both desired and feasible.

15.2 A Changed World–Mechanical Universe

The Scientific Revolution's new mechanical idea of nature, which allowed Westerners to find and quantitatively describe the laws of nature, was its singular contribution to the creation of the modern worldview. They eventually came to believe that matter was the only element in nature, moving according to rules of force in space and time. This ingenious philosophical framework makes it possible to understand and perhaps even control the physical world. The development of a fresh, scientific technique was another aspect of the Scientific Revolution. Galileo Galilei, William Harvey, Robert Boyle, and Isaac Newton were among the scientists and natural philosophers who carried out successful experiments that gave Western science its still-distinctive technique of observation and investigation. No one could have a genuine interest in any part of the physical order by the late seventeenth century without conducting experiments or without meticulously and methodically monitoring how physical events behaved. Modern scientists were able to decipher and explain the mysteries of nature thanks to the mechanical notion of nature and a strict methodology.

The new science started to speak more and more in mathematical terms. Europeans had been using mathematics and geometry to describe many physical processes for ages. A new branch of mathematics known as calculus appeared with the Scientific Revolution, but much more significant was the growing conviction among philosophers that all of nature, including both visible and invisible forces, could be expressed mathematically. Even geometry had advanced to such a level of complexity by the late seventeenth century that even a smart philosopher like Isaac Newton's friend and contemporary John Locke (1632–1704) was unable to comprehend the complicated mathematics employed by Newton in the Principia. A new scientific

culture emerged, and it became extremely significant throughout the eighteenth-century Enlightenment as a paradigm for advancement in both the natural and social sciences.

15.3 The Social Context of the Scientific Revolution

Between the early seventeenth and the middle of the eighteenth centuries, a significant shift in educated Europeans' thought was largely attributed to the new science. The Scientific Revolution was once thought by historians to be the result of a select group of brilliant scientists whose use of mathematics and experimentation led to a fundamentally new knowledge of the natural world. Now, however, it is believed that the scientific revolution was possibly brought about by the educated elites' embrace and application of the new science. If not for other social and political factors, the science of Galileo, Kepler, Descartes, Boyle, and Newton would have remained the domain of a few or, worse still, a dubious, even heretical, view of nature.

The great scientists were not ignorant about those circumstances, nor were their immediate followers or propagandists. Galileo sought the backing of the educated classes and contended that this new mechanical science was appropriate exclusively for them and not for the general public. He contrasted the new science with the traditional knowledge of the scholastic clergy and linked their perception of nature to the naive beliefs of the "masses." He provoked the fury of the church authorities by doing this, and they eventually put an end to him. The new science had much less of an influence on Catholic Europe than in Protestant Europe due to persecution and censorship.

The ability to print was essential for the new mechanical knowledge of nature to be accepted. After Galileo was condemned, Descartes fled France and decided to publish and live in the Netherlands. There, he emphasised the virtues of the new science at every turn, emphasising how it could deflect people from meddling in political issues and instead help to promote order and stability.

The dream of power that mechanical knowledge gave to governments as well as to the early proponents of industry was the second social aspect that aided in the

acceptance of the new science. Even though such knowledge was only a pipe dream in the seventeenth century, it persuaded monarchs and statesmen to support scientific institutes and endeavours.

The new mechanical learning—not that found in Newton's 'Principia', which was far too technical for most people, but the mechanical information in handbooks and lectures—gained application first in Britain and Scotland during the second half of the eighteenth century. The applied mechanics that produced the steam engine and improved coal mining and water engineering in general had its origin in the Newtonian lectures and books that proliferated in Britain during the eighteenth century. The road from the Scientific Revolution to the Industrial Revolution is more direct than has often been realized.

15.4 Factors Responsible for the Revolution

The Scientific Revolution cannot be explained by a single factor. A number of reasons contributed to its development and can be discussed in details.

15.4.1 The Translation Movement in Europe

Christians in Western Europe were intrigued by the tales of Greco-Arabic literature in the Arab-controlled nations, particularly in Spain and Sicily. This prompted numerous excursions into regions of the world ruled by Muslims.

After Toledo (Spain) fell to the Muslims as a result of the Western Crusades against them in 1085, the Arabic translations of Greek scientific works into Latin began. There was a deluge of translations between 1125 and 1200. The majority of the Christians, Muslims, and Jews who interacted with each other spoke Latin, Greek, and Arabic, and Spain had a significant role in this.

Gerard of Cremona was the most significant Arabic to Latin translator. The Latin had heard of Ptolemy's Almagest but didn't have a copy, so he went in search of it. When he arrived in Toledo, he studied Arabic and translated the Almagest into Latin. Aristotle's fundamental works, such as '*Physics'*, '*On the Heavens and World'*, '*On Generation and Corruption'*, and '*Meteorology'*, as well as his writings on logic and scientific method, were among the roughly 70 other volumes he translated from

Arabic into Latin. Al-Khwarizmi, an Arab mathematician, wrote both his algebra and Euclid's geometry, which he also translated. He also translated numerous medical materials, including many works by Galen, as well as significant writings by Arabic physicians and thinkers.

Greek and Latin texts were also translated in addition to Arabic-Latin ones. Academics from Latin-speaking Europe went searching for books in old churches and monasteries, which frequently had saved one or two copies of ancient Greek literature, in the same way that Arab scholars had travelled to faraway regions to do so.

15.4.2 Renaissance Humanism

The term "renaissance" historically refers to a cultural movement that originated in Italy and eventually expanded to the rest of Europe. It lasted roughly from the 14th to the 17th century. What "rebirth" was this cultural movement looking for? What was to be reborn specifically?

The ancient heritage of Greece and Rome was being sought after during the Renaissance. As we have seen, medieval churchmen began gradually unearthing and incorporating ancient works starting around 1000 CE. However, these works were viewed as handmaids to the Bible and were solely utilised to reaffirm Christian ideas.

Beyond the Scholastics, the Renaissance humanists recognised the significance of all classical works of literature from antiquity, regardless of whether they backed Christianity. By education, practise, or identification, a number of early scientists and intellectuals were humanists. They supported innovative approaches to knowledge acquisition and use, which helped spur a "revolution" in science and philosophy and remedy prior errors.

15.4.3 The Invention of the Printing Press

Many people consider the Gutenberg printing press to be the most significant invention of the previous millennium. Johannes Gutenberg created the printing press and independently created a moveable type system in Europe about the year 1450. The same elements still used today, lead, tin, and antimony, were initially utilised by Gutenberg to make his type parts.

Block printing was slower and less reliable for alphabetic scripts than movable-type page setup. Typography and fonts were created as a result of the metal type parts' increased durability and uniformity of letters. The printing press was especially efficient for limited alphabets as in the English language, when compared to the Chinese who were also trying movable type.) The invention of the printing press resulted in the mass manufacture of books on an assembly line, replacing older printing techniques. 3,600 pages could be produced by a single Renaissance printing press in a workday as opposed to around 2,000 by typographic block printing and a few by hand copying. Thousands of thousands of books by best-selling authors like Luther and Erasmus were sold during their lifetimes.

From Mainz, Germany, printing quickly expanded to more than 200 locations in 12 different European nations. However, it took until 1475, 25 years later, for the first book in English to appear. In Western Europe, there were more than twenty million volumes produced by printing presses by the year 1500.

15.4.4 Discovery of the New World

On October 12, 1492, Christopher Columbus and his crew arrived in the Americas. Columbus visited several Caribbean islands that are now the Bahamas during four distinct voyages that began with the one in 1492, in addition to the island that would later become known as Hispaniola. He also travelled the shores of Central and South America. He did not, however, make it to North America, which was, of course, already populated by Native Americans.

Columbus had set out from Spain to establish a Western passage to China, Japan, and India. Europeans had been making their way to Asia either by land (over the fabled "silk road") or by water, via the southernmost point of Africa (the Cape of Good Hope), which links the Atlantic and Indian oceans. For political considerations, the Spanish were prevented from using either of these routes. In view of this, they were drawn to a fresh path to Asia.

The new world's discovery ushered in a new period of exploration, trade, and colonisation. All of the main European nations made an effort to found colonies in the Americas. The native inhabitants that had long before inhabited the Americas suffered severely as a result of being forced into slavery, forced to become Christians,

and as a result of contracting new diseases that the European conquerors had brought with them.

The discovery of the new globe presented new difficulties in Europe. Suddenly, people, plants, and creatures that the Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, English, and French had never seen before were coming into contact with them. It also questioned the authority of custom and tradition. People started to question why the Bible didn't mention the New World. They began to ponder what else the Bible might not know as a result. Could they believe it to be an accurate portrayal of the world? It also sparked a sense of inquiry and curiosity.

15.5 The Meaning of the Scientific Revolution

The Scientific Revolution played a major role in forming the modern mindset by shattering the mediaeval conception of the universe and substituting a completely new one. The idea that a stationary planet was at the centre of a limited, star-ringed universe was no longer held. The notion that the universe was split into higher and lower worlds and that the rules of motion in the sky and on earth were different also vanished. Now, nature could be controlled; the universe was seen as a vast machine that operated in accordance with universal rules that could be represented mathematically.

The New Science played a crucial historical role in reorienting Western thought away from medieval theology and metaphysics and encouraged the study of physical and human problems. In the later Middle Ages, most men of learning were Aristotelians and theologians. But by the mid-eighteenth century, knowledge of Newtonian science and the dissemination of this new learning had become the goal of the educated classes. It was believed scientific knowledge based on observation, experimentation, and rational deduction, could be systematic, verifiable, progressive, and useful. The advocates of this new approach of learning hailed the scientists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They wanted to prove that no institution or dogma had the monopoly on truth. A scientific approach to knowledge if properly applied for the good of all people, could produce a new and better age for all humanity. This outlook was of great significance in that it gave thinkers a new

confidence in the power of the human mind. They started looking critically and sceptically at the institutions and customs of Europe. The reformers of the eighteenth century would work to establish an Age of Enlightenment after being thus motivated.

Traditional Christianity was finally weakened by the Scientific Revolution. It was unclear what God's place was in a mechanical cosmos. Newton had maintained that miracles were still possible because God not only created the cosmos but also intervened in it. Others continued to believe in God as the Creator but saw miracles as exceptions to nature's perfect mechanical design. As soon as the new science's requirements of proof were put forth, other Christian beliefs came under fire as being incompatible with them. Descartes' focus on systematic doubt and clarity of thought, together with Bacon's insistence on close observation, when applied to religious concepts, caused scepticism about the veracity of Christian teachings. Theology eventually began to be seen as a distinct and somewhat unimportant field of intellectual investigation unsuited for the needs of practical, knowledgeable individuals. Along with Christian theology, other widely held and accepted beliefs also came under fire. The aristocratic society despised magic, witchcraft, and astrology, which were nevertheless popular among the common people throughout Europe. The elite culture of the wealthy and landed grew more remote from the public culture as a result of the Scientific Revolution. The majority of people continued to adhere to some form of traditional Christianity, but for the peasants and labourers who were helpless against the forces of nature or the hegemony of the wealthy and landed, the uncertainty of a universe ruled by devils, witches, or the stars persisted as making sense.

By the beginning of the seventeenth century, there was an increasing animosity toward scientific ideas in the Catholic countries where the Scientific Revolution first took place. The Counter Reformation's mentality allowed less intelligent people to use their fears and conceit against any notion they thought was dubious. Galileo was stuck in this hostile context, and in 1616, the church denounced the Copernican system.

As a result, science had started to become a more Protestant phenomena by the second part of the seventeenth century. Major Protestant nations like England and the Netherlands gave more freedom to the press and valued intellectual freedom. Science

ultimately proven to be more in line with the Protestant mindset's emphasis on personal achievement and the commercial exploitation of nature for profit.

15.6 Conclusion

The science of Newton gradually evolved into the science of Western Europe, mechanising, analysing, regulating, and mathematizing nature. The Scientific Revolution led educated Westerners to have a stronger belief than ever that nature could be controlled. The science of industry was mechanical science as it was applied to canals, engines, pumps, and levers. The Age of Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution, two significant milestones of the contemporary West, were thus made possible by the Scientific Revolution, which operated on both an intellectual and a commercial level.

15.7 Model Questions

1. Discuss briefly the socio-cultural context of the scientific revolution.
2. What were the main factors responsible behind the emergence of modern science?
3. Write a short note on the translation movement.

15.8 Suggested Readings

Principe, Lawrence M. *The Scientific Revolution: A Very Short Introduction*, OUP Oxford, 2011.

Shapin, Steven. *The Scientific Revolution*, University of Chicago Press, 2018.

Hellyer, Marcus (ed.). *The Scientific Revolution: The Essential Readings*, Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe in Transition*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Hall, A. *The Scientific Revolution, 1500-1800*, London, 1956.

Unit 16 ❑ Major Developments

Structure

16.0 Objectives

16.1 Introduction

16.2 Phases of the scientific developments

16.3 Geocentrism to Heliocentrism–A Shift of Paradigm

16.4 Copernicus

16.5 Tycho Brahe

16.6 Johannes Kepler

16.7 Galileo Galilei

16.8 Isaac Newton

16.9 Developments in Micro Cosmological Studies

16.10 Conclusion

16.11 Model Questions

16.12 Suggested Readings

16.0 Objectives

This unit will give a clear concept of:

- The various fields of scientific studies which grew as an outcome of the scientific revolution.
- The life and works of the great scientists

16.1 Introduction

The 17th century witnessed a great change in our perception towards the natural world. It was discovered that the sun or the earth are not the exclusive things created by the nature. Sun is just one among million stars and the earth is also just one of

the many planets orbiting the sun. This new notion resulted in the demystification of the universe and around the second half of the 17th century a mechanistic view of the universe emerged. It led to a re-thinking of moral and religious matters as well as the traditional ideas on nature. The process of the establishment of this new view of the universe and the knowledge of science is known as the Scientific Revolution.

16.2 Phases of the scientific developments

J.D. Bernal in his 'Science in History' divided the entire period of the Scientific Revolution into three phases. The first phase witnessed the replacement of the geocentric view of the universe by the heliocentric concept. The second phase may be regarded as the period of formulation of scientific basis. The third phase witnessed the institutionalisation of the science. Categorically the developments in the field of science during the post renaissance period may be divided into two broad groups– first, micro cosmological studies and secondly, the cosmological studies. Micro cosmology includes mainly physiological studies and cosmology includes various theories on creation of the universe, astronomy and physical or natural sciences.

17th century onwards scientific learning and experiments began to increase dramatically. Examinations and understanding of the physical realm were paid good attention during this time. The subsequent creation of scientific method proved crucial to the evolution of science. The rise of science or the natural philosophy as called in those days was mainly associated with spectacular intellectual triumph in mathematics, astronomy and physics. Observation of natural phenomenon, formulation of laws or principles on the basis of experiment and conclusion were the main features of the scientific revolution. These scientific and intellectual changes played the most vital role in the creation of the modern world.

16.3 Geocentrism to Heliocentrism–A Shift of Paradigm

The ancient Greek philosophers, whose ideas shaped the worldview of Western Civilization leading up to the Scientific Revolution in the sixteenth century, had conflicting theories about why the planets moved across the sky. One school of

thought held that the planets circled the Sun, while Aristotle's theories, which ultimately won out, held that the Sun and the planets actually orbited Earth. A ball tossed straight up into the air doesn't land behind the thrower, as Aristotle predicted it would if the Earth were moving, and he observed no other indication that the Earth was moving. This required that the Earth be locked in place while the planets, the Sun, and the fixed dome of stars circled about it, according to Aristotle. Christian theology developed a geocentric worldview that is both a religious and a natural philosophical concept. Despite that, it was actually a priest who brought back the notion that the Earth moves around the Sun.

Nicolaus Copernicus, a Polish clergyman, suggested in 1515 that the Earth was a planet similar to Venus or Saturn and that all planets revolved around the Sun. He did not publish his theory until 1543, just before his passing, out of fear of criticism (some academics believe Copernicus was more worried about the scientific flaws in his theories than he was with the Church's rejection). Few people subscribed to the ideology, and those who did were occasionally accused of being heretics. Giordano Bruno, an Italian scientist, was burnt at the stake for espousing Copernicus' heliocentric theory of the universe along with other heretical notions.

But the case for a heliocentric solar system grew stronger with time. Galileo discovered that moons orbited Jupiter in 1610 when he focused his telescope to the night sky for the first time in human history. These moons could not exist if Aristotle's theories about everything orbiting the Earth were accurate. Galileo also saw Venus's phases, which demonstrated that the planet revolves around the Sun. Galileo was prosecuted for heresy by the Roman Inquisition and sentenced to a lifetime of house arrest.

Johannes Kepler, a German mathematician, published a set of rules that govern the planets' orbits around the Sun at the same period. The mathematical formulas, which are still in use today, provide precise predictions of the motion of the planets according to Copernican theory. Isaac Newton slammed the hammer down on the Aristotelian, geocentric theory of the cosmos in 1687. Using Kepler's laws as a foundation, Newton provided an explanation for the planets' motion around the Sun and named the force that held it in check, gravity.

16.4 Copernicus

Mathematician and astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus proposed that the sun was fixed at the centre of the universe and that the earth revolved around it. In order to eliminate Ptolemy's equant, a hypothetical point around which the celestial bodies appeared to follow Aristotle's requirement for the uniform circular motion of all celestial bodies, Copernicus decided that he could only accomplish his goal by using a heliocentric model. Copernicus was troubled by the fact that Ptolemy's geocentric model of the universe failed to follow Aristotle's requirement for the uniform circular motion of all celestial As a result, he developed the idea of a universe in which the size of the planets' orbits directly related to how far away they were from the sun. Although Copernicus's heliocentric theory was very divisive at the time, it marked the beginning of a shift in how people perceived the world, and Copernicus came to be recognised as the father of the Scientific Revolution. When Copernicus first started promoting the heliocentric idea is impossible to pinpoint. He most likely adopted this hypothesis after 1500. Furthermore, it is impossible to pinpoint the precise reason Copernicus started to promote the heliocentric cosmology. Despite Copernicus' significance in the history of philosophy, there aren't many primary sources about him. The 'Commentariolus', the 'Letter against Werner', and 'On the Revolutions' were the only astronomical writings he produced. He also published his translation of Theophylactus' letters and produced several iterations of his treatise on coinage. The majority of the few letters he left behind also have diocesan-related content. Regrettably, the biography by Rheticus, which should have given researchers a wealth of knowledge, has been destroyed. As a result, many of the most intriguing questions surrounding Copernicus's theories and writings have been answered through speculation and inference, and we can only speculate as to why Copernicus chose to embrace the heliocentric theory.

16.5 Tycho Brahe

Tycho Brahe was born in 1546 to an aristocratic family in Denmark. King Fredrik's kind assistance was very helpful to Tycho Brahe. The king gave Brahe an

island he named Hven. He transformed this island into his own tiny nation. On Hven, Brahe erected a palace that he called Uraniborg in honour of the sky goddess Urania. On the island, he also constructed an observatory. Brahe made use of the island as his home base for making astronomical observations for more than 20 years. Tycho Brahe lost the favour of the Danish king in 1597, so he moved to Wandsbech in what is now Germany. He finally made Prague his home and kept making astronomical observations there. Tycho Brahe conducted reliable observations over a 20-year span that lent credence to Copernicus' previous heliocentric theory. The sextant and a compass were the sole tools used to make these observations. Brahe recorded more than 1000 stars. Additionally, he demonstrated that comets were actual spacecraft and not merely a by-product of the atmosphere of Earth. Brahe revealed anomalies in the orbit of the Moon and found a brand-new star in the Cassiopeia formation. Brahe created a variety of instruments, such as the Tyconian Quadrant, which was widely imitated and inspired the development of more advanced observational tools. Tyco Brahe employed Johannes Kepler as his assistant in 1600. Kepler would subsequently use Brahe's work as the foundation for the planetary movement rules that he created. The castle and observatory built by him on the island Hven were destroyed within a few years of his death.

16.6 Johannes Kepler

The astronomer and mathematician Johannes Kepler of Austria convinced Tycho Brahe to hire him as his assistant so that he may use his planetary tables. Kepler was a Neopythagorean and Platonist by training, and his book 'Mysterium Cosmographicum' is a good example of his tendency toward mysticism. But Kepler was also a firmly committed Copernican. He actually intended to use Tycho's findings to support the Copernican idea. Upon the passing of Brahe, he examined the enormous amount of data. He created new planetary tables using this data. He first concluded that planetary orbits have an oval shape, but he later rejected this conclusion for aesthetic grounds. He discovered a mistake in his calculations and fixed it. The new shape happened to be an ellipse, which fitted well into Kepler's Pythagorean views about nature.

Kepler explored a variety of mystical concepts, including the Platonic solids and musical analogies, to characterise planetary orbits. Three pearls, meanwhile, were scattered throughout his extensive computations in 'Astronomia Nova', Kepler's rules of planetary motion. Kepler is credited with creating these principles and is regarded as the father of physical astronomy. According to the first law, the Sun is at one focus of the elliptical orbits that the planets follow. According to the second law, the planets cover the same amount of ground at the same rate (which is equivalent to the statement of conservation of angular momentum.) According to the third law, the semimajor axis cube is proportional to the period squared. Kepler was of the opinion that the planets remained in their orbits by a "anima motrix" (motive soul). However, later he modified it to "vis motrix" (life force). He also developed the concept of a ray and as an aspect of astronomy studied optics in 'Astronomiae Pars Optica' (1604).

16.7 Galileo Galilei

Galileo has been referred to as the "father" of modern science, the scientific method, observational astronomy, and modern physics. He was born on February 15, 1564, in Pisa, Italy.

Galileo worked on practical science and technology, describing the properties of pendulums and "hydrostatic balances," as well as researching projectile motion, inertia, gravity, and the theory of relativity. He invented the thermoscope, produced a number of military compasses, and employed the telescope to conduct scientific examinations of celestial objects. Telescopic confirmation of Venus' phases, observations of Jupiter's four largest satellites, observations of Saturn's rings, and analyses of lunar craters and sunspots are only a few of his contributions to observational astronomy.

Galileo's promotion of Copernican heliocentrism—the idea that the Earth revolves around the sun on a daily basis—was opposed by the Catholic Church and certain astronomers. The Roman Inquisition looked into the issue in 1615 and came to the conclusion that heliocentrism was wrong, ridiculous, and heretical because it went against Holy Scripture.

In 'Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems' (1632), Galileo later defended his ideas. This work appeared to criticise Pope Urban VIII, alienating the Pope and the Jesuits, who had previously backed Galileo. The Inquisition tried him, judged him to be "vehemently suspect of heresy," and had him retract his statements. He spent the rest of his life under house arrest. During this time, he wrote 'Two New Sciences' (1638), primarily concerning kinematics and the strength of materials, summarizing work he had done around forty years earlier. In 1638 he went completely blind and was suffering from insomnia and a painful hernia and. At the age of 77, after suffering from fever and heart palpitations, he died on 8 January 1642.

16.8 Isaac Newton

On January 4, 1643, Isaac Newton was born in Woolsthorpe, England. Three months prior to his birth, his farmer father, also called Isaac Newton, passed away. When Isaac was three years old, his mother remarried and left the small boy in the custody of his grandparents. Isaac was largely an only child. He would love to work and live alone for the rest of his life, concentrating on his writing and studies. Isaac enrolled in Cambridge's college in 1661. He would spend a large portion of his time at Cambridge, where he would eventually become a professor of mathematics and a member of the Royal Society (a group of scientists in England. He ultimately won the election to serve as a member of parliament for Cambridge University.

Between 1665 and 1667, Isaac was forced to leave Cambridge due to the Great Plague. He developed his theories on calculus, gravitation, and the laws of motion during these two years of study and seclusion in his Woolsthorpe residence. Newton was appointed the London Royal Mint's warden in 1696. He took his responsibilities seriously and worked to restructure England's currency as well as root out corruption. In 1703, he won the presidency of the Royal Society, and in 1705, Queen Anne knighted him.

The 'Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica', often known as the 'Mathematical Foundations of Natural Philosophy', was one of Newton's most significant works and was published in 1687. He discussed the three laws of motion

and the law of universal gravitation in this essay. One of the most significant works in the history of science would be this one. It not only defined the foundational ideas of contemporary physics but also introduced the notion of gravity.

In 1703, Newton was elected to lead the Royal Society. He became a Knight in 1705, being the first scientist to do so. On March 31, 1727, he passed away in London, England. He was laid to rest at Westminster Abbey after receiving a gallant funeral.

16.9 Developments in Micro Cosmological Studies

As was already indicated, biological sciences, and more specifically medical sciences like anatomy and physiology, are included in the microcosmological studies. The scientific revolution greatly enhanced this field of study. Modern science and the scientific method were brought about by the scientific revolution. It contributed to the advancement of medicine by providing doctors with more knowledge about the human body and a better way to look into the phenomena that surround it. The scientific revolution produced a methodology for evaluating theories, and it is this methodology that is responsible for later discoveries like the germ theory.

During the scientific revolution, a number of works on biological investigations were written. The extensive work 'History of Animals' was written by Conrad Gesnar. Modern botany has benefited from the work of Leonard Fuchs, Otto Brunfels, and Jeromebock. Excellent documentation of marine life was produced by Guillaume de Rondolet.

At this period, pathology also started to emerge. During this time, numerous studies on various diseases were conducted. Skin conditions, rickets, apoplexy, diabetes, gout, and tuberculosis are among them. But among all of these studies, anatomy was unquestionably the most well-founded. It carefully examined how the bones, muscles, and organs were arranged. During this time, physiology was developing as well. Harvey made the blood flow public knowledge. In 1628, his observation was made public. Undoubtedly, that was a highly significant discovery. The 'Structure of Human Body' was penned by Vesalius. This book was published in 1543. However, it was mostly based on Hippocrates and Galen's physiological

theories, which were developed by Greek scholars. Eustachi conducted extensive research on the ear, throat, and tube that connects the throat to the middle ear. Malpighe used a microscope to demonstrate the blood flow, converting belief into reality. Stephen Hales used hydrostatic equipment to conduct significant research on animal blood pressure. Albecht von Haller offered a more sophisticated perspective on mechanical physiology. He demonstrated how the body functioned as a sort of filter, adding or removing the proper nutritious particles from the blood stream as needed. He established the kidneys' functionality on the basis of this.

Over time, chemical science also advanced. Pre-modern alchemy gave rise to contemporary chemistry. The alchemists of this time period made numerous contributions. However, compared to the other natural sciences, their responses to the new trend were a little slower. The most well-known experimentalist and theorist in the subject of chemistry in the 17th century was Robert Boyle. In the 18th century, chemistry saw a dramatic transformation because to the work of Lavoisier.

16.10 Conclusion

Around the 17th century, a new style had developed in this fashion. Not only did the scientific revolution revolutionise academic paradigms, but it also altered the entire course of our lives. In the truest sense of the word, this marked the start of the modern era.

16.11 Model Questions

1. Write an essay on the scientific revolution.
2. How did the concept of heliocentric world change the course of science?
3. Write an essay on the scientists of revolution era.
4. Write short notes on (a) Copernicus (b) Brahe (c) Kepler (d) Galileo

16.12 Suggested Readings

Bernal, J.D. *Science in History,* Faber & Faber, 2010.

Fauber, L.S. *Heaven on Earth: How Copernicus, Brahe, Kepler and Galileo Discovered the Modern World*, Pegasus Books, 2019.

Miller, Ron. *Recentering the universe: The Radical Theories of Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton*, Twenty First Century Books, 2013.

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe in Transition*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Hall, A. *The Scientific Revolution, 1500-1800*, London, 1956.

Unit 17 ❑ The Formulation of Scientific Method

Structure

17.0 Objectives

17.1 Introduction

17.2 Background–Aristotle

17.3 Renaissance and the Introduction of Rationalism

17.4 Great Thinkers who Formulated the Scientific Methods

17.5 Conclusion

17.6 Model Questions

17.7 Suggested Readings

17.0 Objectives

This unit will enquire into the factors responsible for:

- The formulation of scientific methods during the scientific revolution
- The contributions of various great thinkers in this formulation process.

17.1 Introduction

Systematic experimentation was stressed as the most reliable research technique during the scientific revolution. This method led to advancements in a variety of academic subjects, including mathematics, physics, astronomy, biology, and many more. The way society views nature has changed as a result of these advances. It was crucial in advancing modern science in European culture. Some of history's most enlightened cultures, as well as some of the greatest scientists or natural philosophers, contributed to the creation of the scientific method.

17.2 Background–Aristotle

The father of science, Aristotle, was the first to understand the significance of empirical measurement since he thought that knowledge could only be gained by expanding on what is previously known. Aristotle made a contribution in the areas of measurement and observation, which are the cornerstones of science. He proposed the use of induction as a technique for knowledge acquisition and recognised the need for empirical evidence to back up abstract arguments. His so-called "proto-scientific technique" involves meticulously noting everything.

The first indication of a scientific technique is the presence of literature reviews, agreement, and measurement. Greeks were the first to categorise and give names to distinct disciplines of study, such as Physics, Biology, Politics, Zoology, etc.

17.3 Renaissance and the Introduction of Rationalism

One of the most significant turning points in the development of scientific method occurred during the Renaissance, when European intellectuals combined the knowledge of the Greeks and the Muslims to create a new idea.

Mankind had a strong desire and search for the ultimate meaning and the primal cause for everything before the renaissance period could take place. The human race conducted a thorough quest during the classical era. Many myths and tales were being produced. Then as time went on, during the Middle Ages, new ideologies began to spread among people. God is the root cause of everything. At that time, monasteries and the monks who lived there were accorded far more importance. The teachings of the church were mindlessly accepted by the populace. The church officials encouraged the emergence of such false understandings. As the years went by, the Renaissance era underwent a significant development. Based on human reasoning, rationalism raised humanity. This was the time when new ideologies first emerged as a result of the capacity of human thought, particularly from the standpoint of how religion and science were developing. It gave rise to humanism, a term that denotes the development of the natural ideas that came from the thinkers of this era. Philosophers and scientists both contributed fresh, fact- and logic-based concepts. Numerous facts were released, however some people were not willing to accept the

truth. The religious, political, and social landscapes saw significant change during this time. During this time, there was a significant change in the society's systems and function.

It goes without saying that it would be difficult to name every single academic who made a contribution to this laborious process, but some names always come up in any account of the development of the scientific method.

17.4 Great Thinkers who Formulated the Scientific Methods

One of the first European scholars to develop scientific procedures was Roger Bacon. He came up with the concept of making observations, formulating a hypothesis, and conducting experiments to verify the hypothesis. He also properly documented his tests so that other scientists might replicate them and confirm his findings.

Although Galileo is most famous for his ground breaking experiment on gravity, he also made significant contributions to the scientific method. Indeed, scientists like Einstein and Stephen Hawking hailed him as the founder of modern science. His approach influenced physics and other disciplines that rely on mathematical theorems. His approaches, which laid the foundation for the division between science and religion, included standardising measures so that experimental results could be verified everywhere. Galileo knew that no practical evidence could exactly match theoretical expectations, thus he employed a largely inductive scientific technique. He thought it would be impossible to account for every potential variable in an experiment. Galileo proposed the idea that mass had no bearing on gravitational acceleration in the field of physics, for instance.

On January 22, 1561, Francis Bacon was born at London's York House, in the Strand. He exhibited an inquisitive mind and one of the best intellects. He spent three years at Trinity College, when he started to design his major philosophical work and gained a deep distaste for the constrictive mediaeval academic education of the period.

When it was published, he became not only well-known but also indestructible in the field of methodical study. He developed and popularised the scientific method,

which relies on obtaining and analysing evidence from experiments and observations rather than relying on logical reasoning to determine the laws of nature.

The 2,000-year-old natural philosophy of Aristotle saw the beginning of its demise with the Baconian method, which also unleashed a torrent of fresh scientific discoveries, especially in the hands of adherents like Robert Boyle. Bacon's goal was to replace Aristotle and Plato's works, which were founded on logical and philosophical reasoning, with a new corpus of scientific knowledge supported by experiments and observations, in contrast to the majority of intellectuals of his time. He also took issue with the way that Aristotle, Plato, and others, such as Pythagoras, combined religious and scientific ideas. The two, in Bacon's opinion, ought to be kept apart. People who claimed that the natural rules were a part of a larger purpose aroused his profound suspicion. He believed that they should be found and, if possible, used.

The '*Novum Organum'* (The New Tool), Bacon's most important work, outlined what came to be known as the Baconian Method of science. It was part of his '*Instauratio magna'* book series and was published in 1620. He was an advocate of science's inductive approach. You switch from specific facts to a general norm in this way. You don't begin with a theory or hypothesis. On the other side, Aristotle employed the deductive approach. From a fundamental principle, he would transition to concrete facts. He began by applying rules that he had created using deductive reasoning.

Nine months after Bacon's death, the man who personified the effectiveness of his inductive approach was born. Robert Boyle was the man's name. Boyle adhered to Bacon. He thought that gathering data through experimentation would help him find new natural laws. He was correct, too. He released chemistry as a true quantitative science by dismantling the mysticism of the alchemists using the inductive technique. Boyle was able to improve Bacon's method because he had more hands-on laboratory experience than Bacon. Boyle was the first scientist to write detailed experimental instructions for subsequent researchers, stressing the significance of obtaining accurate, repeatable results.

The '*Discourse',* which was first published in 1637 and is more properly known as '*Discourse on the Method for Rightly Directing One's Reason and Searching for Truth in the Sciences'*, is René Descartes' major work on the scientific method. His

other books, which also address methodological issues, are still important for comprehending the Cartesian approach to research. The typical perception of Descartes is that he advocated for all science to be based on correct deductions from self-evident facts, similar to how Euclid made geometry demonstrative, rather than being based on observation and experimentation. Descartes is sometimes portrayed as a proponent of the a priori method of knowledge discovery, which is based on the theory of innate ideas and produces an intellectual understanding of the essences of the objects with which we are familiar with our sensory experience of the universe. The method of Newton, Bacon, and the British empiricists, who rejected the metaphysics of essences and the doctrine of innate ideas, is then contrasted to this metaphysics of essences and the accompanying a priori method. For them, knowledge of the world of sensible appearances was to be located not by leaving it to travel to a realm of essences, but by using the method of experiment through which one could identify patterns in this world of causes and effects. This common perception does have some validity, but Descartes' and the empiricists' ideas go far further than this straightforward illustration. Descartes believed that experience and experimentation are just as important for gaining knowledge as those that are known a priori.

Descartes contends that the essential mechanical rules that govern empirical study in sciences like optics and physiology—laws about laws that he assumes to govern these sciences—are not themselves empirical but rather necessary truths that can be known a priori. The logical framework of the experimental method in natural science is something that Descartes is well aware of, as we have seen so far. In that sense, he does not hold the a priori method to be universally applicable. He is still legitimately to be included among the rationalists, nevertheless. In fact, he contends that all rules may, at the very least, be known a priori in theory. It's only that the structure of the world of common things is too complex for us to infer from self-evident premises the laws governing the mechanisms behind commonplace observable things and activities with our finite minds and limited understanding of the a priori structure of the world. Knowing in advance that there are more particular laws with the general structure of physical processes and machines is the law about laws. However, determining what those particular laws are will require empirical study because they are conceptually too complex for us to know a priori given our limited knowledge.

Descartes contends that everything, including the physical universe we can perceive with our senses, possesses an inner essence or form that accounts for how things typically appear to be structured. These essences or structures are discernible by reason rather than sense. The ability to understand these underlying causes of things, the reasons why certain patterns and regularities exist in the sense world rather than others, is precisely what is meant by the word "reason." He assumes that when a form is known, it exists physically in the knower's consciousness because both the knower and the known have identities. Descartes contends that everything, including the physical universe we can perceive with our senses, possesses an inner essence or form that accounts for how things typically appear to be structured. These essences or structures are discernible by reason rather than sense. The ability to understand these underlying causes of things, the reasons why certain patterns and regularities exist in the sense world rather than others, is precisely what is meant by the word "reason." He assumes that when a form is known, it exists physically in the knower's consciousness because both the knower and the known have identities.

Descartes's adherents, known as Cartesians, included both his immediate successors and his contemporaries but shown a stronger preference for philosophical and mathematical theories. His friend and followers in Holland, Henry de Roy or Regius (who followed Descartes in physics and the derivative sciences but disagreed with him on matters of metaphysics), Johann Clauberg in Germany, Malebranche, Simon Foucher, Rohault, Claude Clerselier, and Pierre-Sylvain Regis in France are among them. They made more or less intentional attempts to fill in the gaps they perceived in Descartes's work on human understanding, with each offering his own justification and frequently sparring with one another. Descartes' 'Principia Philosophica', which he published, served as the foundation for the Cartesian theory of mechanical physics. He made the claim that the universe is full of many microscopic particles or corpuscles that make up matter. These particles are constantly moving thanks to the help of God. He completely rejected the idea of a vacuum, believing the universe to be full of constantly rotating particles. The sun is at the centre of the vortex, and the planets and other celestial bodies were propelled into space by the motion of this endless number of vortices. Using the same mechanical principles used in the design of machines, he claimed to have also determined the qualities of the entire cosmos.

Descartes' mechanical philosophy included epistemological claims about what constituted true knowledge in addition to ontological statements about the nature of the universe and the things that inhabit it. It insisted that a mechanical explanation of a physical process be given.

By the 18th century, Newton's theories had surpassed Descartes's dualistic conception of thought and matter as the dominant physical theory. However, there is no denying that European philosophers have been heavily influenced by the Cartesian school.

Thus, Bacon and Descartes gave the avenues for the study of contemporary science, and future phases of scientific advancement were guided by the scientific procedures. The importance of empirical science based on experiments was emphasised by the Baconians in England. The goal of Bacon's concept of research as a group endeavour was to benefit society as a whole practically. Many scientists were greatly influenced by him, including the English Royal Society's founders. Important scientists like Robert Boyle, a renowned chemist who developed Boyle's Law on temperature and gas pressure, William Harvey, a well-known physician who discovered the circulation of blood, and Robert Hooke, a well-known biologist who used a microscope to discover the cellular structure of plants, all adopted this experimental approach. In France, Pierre Gassendi worked on atomic theory in the Cartesian tradition, Blaise Pascal made contributions to the study of conic sections that formed the basis of integral calculus, discovered barometric pressure, and developed a theorem. Not just in England and France but across all of Europe, the intellectual community started paying significant attention to the guiding principles of scientific inquiry and the practises of science. Around the time of Newton, various societies in Western Europe began to institutionalise science.

17.5 Conclusion

Thus, the theoretical or methodological formulations began to take shape at the same time as many famous scientists' exceptional accomplishments. Galileo collected data and made observations as Bacon was writing in England about the value of data and observations, which led to the development of new theories that would eventually

displace Aristotle's physics and astronomy. Boyle was also inspired by Galileo's work. William Gilbert, who lived in England, had already put what Bacon advocated into reality when he proved through experimentation in 1600 that our globe behaves like a huge magnet. The principles governing planetary motion were also found by Johannes Kepler in Bohemia utilising Tycho Brahe's excellent planet data. The earth and other planets orbit the sun in elliptical orbits, according to Kepler's rules, among other things. The natural philosophy of Aristotle was irreparably undermined and a new era of rational science was inaugurated by Bacon, Galileo, Gilbert, and Kepler more than anyone else.

17.6 Model Questions

1. Write a short note on Aristotle's scientific method.
2. Write briefly on the formulation of scientific method highlighting on the contribution of Rene Descartes.
3. Determine the contributions of Roger Bacon to modern science?
4. Why is Francis Bacon famous?

17.7 Suggested Readings

Nolan, Lawrence. The Cambridge Descartes Lexicon, Cambridge University Press, 2015. Online Publication, 2016 https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511894695.

Bacon, Francis. *The New Organon*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1960.

Descartes, René. *Discourse on Method and The Meditations*. London: Penguin, 1968

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe in Transition*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Hall, A. *The Scientific Revolution, 1500-1800*, London, 1956.

Unit 18 ❑ Science and Religion

Structure

18.0 Objectives

18.1 Introduction

18.2 Science and Religion–Two Parallel Lines

18.3 Scientific Revolution as a Product of the Protestant Reformation

18.4 Other Views

18.5 Conclusion

18.6 Model Questions

18.7 Suggested Readings

18.0 Objectives

This unit will enquire into the relationship between Christianity and modern science.

18.1 Introduction

The link between religion, more notably Christianity, and modern science has been the subject of a protracted discussion. It is intriguing to note right away that many of the new science proponents during the scientific revolution made clear linkages between the reform of religion and a broader reform of knowledge. Francis Bacon, an English philosopher, was right when he said that the renewal of the Church served as a template and a motivation for the future renewal of scientific knowledge. Many other academics, besides just Bacon, had the same opinion. However, other academics have argued that there was little to no connection between Protestantism and modern science. The development of modern science was not confined to the Protestant states, in fact one can say it originated in Italy which was a Catholic state.

18.2 Science and Religion–Two Parallel Lines

During the Scientific Revolution there was hardly any explicit conflict between science and religion, apart from Galileo's famous clash with the Roman Inquisition. Scientists generally adopted (or at least did not openly reject) the religious views of their culture. However, there was a significant reorientation in how men reconceived God. In their thinking he played a much smaller role in the universe than earlier attributed to him. One key to this reorientation was the metaphor of "God's two books"—the Book of Scripture and the Book of Nature—which were considered equally deserving of man's attention. This analogy was popularised in the 17th century by Francis Bacon and has its roots in Thomas Aquinas's division of the worlds into faith and reason.

Bacon's admonition against the mixing of the texts of the two books was commonly acknowledged among his many 17th-century followers, and it became widely accepted that the two should be examined quite separately. As far as religious belief was concerned, Bacon urged men to "give to faith only that which is faiths." This attitude was liberating for scientific work, keeping it largely unmolested by religion. The opposite attitude—that religion is closely connected with the study of the physical world—had led to the Church's persecution of Galileo. He had advocated an idea—that the earth moves—that conflicted with Biblical passages implying that the earth does not move. The writings of Bacon were important on all of Europe's new scientific societies, but they were particularly so in England, where the Royal Society of London's founders made explicit mention of them. As a result of this impact, "no one ever presented a public case for a scientific fact with a theological argument" at the Royal Society.

It has been pointed out by historians that many of the 17th-century English scientists had ecclesiastical careers. But even these "theologian-scientists" sought to isolate their religious beliefs from their scientific studies, in effect leading "double lives": "English scientists *qua* scientists kept out of the sacristy, English theologians *qua* theologians kept out of the rooms where experiments were performed." Among the accomplished scientists, the two figures most famous for their strong religious beliefs were Robert Boyle and Isaac Newton. But even these two were

careful to keep a separation between God's two books. According to one historian, "When working as a 'naturalist,' Boyle sought to 'discourse of natural things' only, without 'intermeddling with supernatural mysteries.'" Newton wrote extensively on religion, but his books on science did not contain any religious arguments for his scientific conclusions. When he became the President of the Royal Society, "he banned anything remotely touching on religion."

18.3 Scientific Revolution as a Product of the Protestant Reformation

A number of scholars subscribe the view that the scientific revolution of the 17th century was a product of the protestant reformation. Among the scholars argue that the rise of the modern science was closely associated with the ideas of the protestant religion and believed that the experimental science developed by the 17th century because of the new ethical considerations provided by the Protestant thinkers, the names of Max Weber, R.K. Merton, S.F. Mason and Christopher Hill may be included.

Max Weber opined that the Protestant religion more specifically Calvinism helped largely to build a favourable condition for experimental science. Similar view was showed Robert K. Merton in his pioneer work 'Science, Technology and Society in the Seventeenth Century England'. He particularly emphasized on those factors which were to be seen in the Protestant ethics and those which promote active life and scientific experimentation. He considers the role of Puritanism as crucial to the emergence of modern science. He compares scientists with theologians or religious reformers and suggested that there are three elements of relationship exist between the two. First the early Protestant ethos was expressed in a scientific thought. Secondly, Calvinism emphasized good deeds, which the scientists also considered important hard work and experimentation. Thirdly, Merton suggests that there was a definite combination between the minute details of the political doctrines of Calvinism and the principles of modern science. He argued that Protestant religious values, particularly those of the Puritan and Priest sects created an intellectual atmosphere that helped scientific development. After citing several examples from the 17th

century England he argued that the social utility of both science and technology was increasingly recognized by Puritan values. Merton tried to provide evidence to his argument that Protestants played a major lead in the Royal Society of London. He never implied that it was the sanction of science by religion that led to the discoveries of Boyle or Newton and that Protestant religion was the primary variable on which science was based. Merton suggests that the Puritan values helped to create an audience that was receptive to programmes for the improvement of human life.

Important observations came from S.F. Mason also. Mason ascribes in his famous work '*The Scientific Revolution and Protestant Reformation'* that a variety of factors to the growth of scientific movements. He points out that the new technical problems in the field of industry; navigation and war were caused by economic stimulus, the religious drive by the Puritans towards performing good work and many other factors. Mason suggests that throughout the 16th century science was closely connected with mercantile enterprise. The merchants promoted science through the translation of scientific works and sponsorship of lectures on mathematics. Mason points out that during the early 17th century English science remained connected with navigational and mercantile problems. William Gilbert and Francis Bacon stressed the value of science for the promotion of industry and the building of a new worldview. During the Civil war Greeshan college became the meeting place of a group of scientists who termed themselves the 'Philosophical College', which became the immediate precursor of the Royal Society. However, such factors were essentially practical and could account only for specific branches of science such as magnetism, machines and astronomy but not the structure and pattern of new theories of early modern science, i.e. the ideological theories of which the theology of Calvin was most important in England. Thus the impetus to scientific activity was given by the religious ethos and this, according to Mason, was the most important element that integrated science with religion in the 17th-century England.

Christopher Hill, who was one of the most important contributors of the said debate, argued that the scientific development was an ordinary social happening along with the rise of Puritanism and the bourgeois class. In his two monumental work '*The Century of Revolution'* and *'The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution'* he tried to focus on the intellectual movements related to the English

Revolution. According to him there was a close connection between Puritanism, modern science, merchant class and the skilled artisans. This was for him correctly reflected in the establishment of Greeshan College in 1579, as this college was the creation of the merchants and traders of London and it had a number of scientists on its faculty. Unlike the previous colleges Greeshan offered numerous subjects. Not only that, it became associated to an increasing degree with the Puritan movement during the English Civil War. The group of scientists who laid the foundation of organized experimental science between 1640 and 1660 had their intellectual root in Puritan social values. Greeshan College played a vital role in the establishment of the connection between all those groups and it became the meeting point of many scientists who were the immediate precursors of the Royal Society of London.

18.4 Other Views

A number of scholars have rejected the above mentioned view and opined that there is hardly any connection between the Protestant reformation and the rise of the modern science. Among these scholars mention may be made of M.M. Knappen, M.H. Curtis, J.B. Cannot, T.K. Rabb, T.S. Kuhn and H.F. Kearney et. al.

H.F. Kearney had criticized Christopher Hill for treating the scientific revolution too narrowly. Kearney argued that the scientific revolution was not confined only within the geographical limit of England. It was an European revolution. Secondly the merchants and the craftsmen were not the sole source of the patronage for mathematics or other experimental sciences. Kearney nullified the relationship between the Puritanism and the modern science as for him the term Puritanism itself has a very ambiguous meaning. Although he criticized the theory of relationship between the Puritanism and the modern science but he did not deny the relationship between the religious radicalism and the pursuit of science. Throughout the 16th century a rival movement was taking shape simultaneously with the Protestant reformation. This movement included many important figures from both Catholic and the Protestant faiths like Lipsius, Montaigne, Galileo, Kepler and Francis Bacon.

T.K. Rabb also criticized Christopher Hill and had opined that there was no clear stastical connection can be found between Puritanism and the rise of modern

experimental sciences at least up to 1640. Rather the main centre of the early experimental sciences was Italy which was a Catholic country. Not only that, Copernicus himself was a Catholic priest and held a strong religious view. Galileo and Descartes also wished to stay within the religious fold. Johannes Kepler was a Protestant but he had good terms with the Catholics. In fact he was largely dependent on Jesuits for his astronomical experiments. William Ashworth supported Rabb's view and opined that the Jesuit scientific enterprise was first such collaborative enterprise. Jesuits mostly had keen interest of the value of precision in experimental science. Many of them were directly associated in practising science and made many important discoveries. But at the same time it is true that the Jesuit practice of science was limited in that sense that there was no proper philosophy of nature and that is why the Jesuit science could not be able to achieve the similar position of the modern experimental science practised by Descartes, Galileo or Pascal.

Unlike the other scholars Toby Huff totally rejected the theory of any religious influences on the rise of the modern science. Rather he explained the entire process from a culturalist point of view. He opined that for free and objective investigation of nature, autonomous legal corporate bodies are deeply needed. The establishment of various universities in Europe fulfilled this need. The universities promoted independent learning and free thought. Thus 14th century onwards the progress of Arabs and Chinese Science declined gradually and European science rose dramatically. However we should not overlook the economic structure also. The rise of modern science had connection with the contemporary economic context. The dramatic shift from feudalism to capitalism which was taking shape from the 16th century had deep impact on the emergence of modern experimental science.

The impact of scientific notion on the religion was also deep. A concept of rational religion developed by this time. In spite of being devout Christians John Locke and Isaac Newton both had argued for this rationality independent of miracles and mysteries contained in the Bible. These rational religious practitioners were physio-theologians who attempted to explain God's natural world in a scientific way rather than blindly accept the biblical explanations.

18.5 Conclusion

The great discoveries of the Scientific Revolution demonstrated the awesome power of man's rational mind. Since the fall of Rome, Christianity had dominated all cultural and intellectual activity in the West. But by the end of the 17th century, Christianity had lost its dominance in the realm of the intellect, and science had become the primary source of inspiration for those eager to use their minds.

Although explicit religious belief remained at high levels among the new scientists, it moved from the foreground to the background of their minds. Aquinas had managed to segregate religion from reason in a manner allowing reason to flourish. Revealed theology—true religion—was displaced by natural theology, dramatically loosening the shackles of religion and inspiring men to look at reality and think. The universe was increasingly seen as a machine that God had designed and then left alone, enabling man, through reason, to discover the laws of nature and to transform the world to suit his needs.

The foundation and cause of the Scientific Revolution was not religion or faith but observation and logic. There was still a vestige of a God as a "explanation" of the universe, but future generations would come to understand that there was no need for a God to explain anything.

The assertion made by modern religious apologists that the Scientific Revolution was inspired by religion and that faith in some way preceded science is illogical from both a historical and a logical standpoint. The foundation and cause of the Scientific Revolution was not religion or faith but observation and logic.

18.6 Model Questions

1. Discuss briefly the relation between religion and modern science.
2. How far it is correct to say that the scientific revolution was a product of Protestantism?
3. Who believed that there was a close connection between Puritanism, modern science, merchant class and the skilled artisans.

4. How was Cristopher Hill's views criticized?

18.7 Suggested Readings

Wootton, David. 'History: Science and the Reformation' in *Nature* 550, 454-455, October, 2017.

Deason, G. (1985). The Protestant Reformation and the Rise of Modern Science. *Scottish Journal of Theology, 38*(2), 221-240. doi:10.1017/S0036930600041363.

Brooke, John Hedley. 'The parallel between scientific and religious reform (chapter III). In Science and Religion: Some Historical Perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe in Transition*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Hall, A. *The Scientific Revolution, 1500-1800*, London, 1956.

Module IV: Mercantilism and European Economics: 17th and 18th Centuries

Unit 19 ❑ Origins

Structure

19.0 Objectives

19.1 Introduction

19.2 Mercantilism–A Brief Survey

19.3 16th century Europe–The Atlantic Revolution

19.4 National monarchy and economic nationalism

19.5 Conclusion

19.6 Model Questions

19.7 Suggested Readings

19.0 Objectives

The unit will focus on:

- The origin and context of the emergence of mercantilism.
- Atlantic Revolution in 16th Century Europe
- Relationship between national monarchy and economic nationalism

19.1 Introduction

Mercantilism can be explained as an economic theory that lays stress on resource acquisition while keeping a positive trade balance with other nations. Mercantilism Mercantilist policies emphasise resource acquisition while keeping a positive trade balance with other nations. Mercantilism is seen as a type of economic protectionism

because it aims to increase exports while reducing imports. This 16th-century economic theory, which depends on government action to limit imports and safeguard indigenous industries, had a direct impact on the formation of nation states. Nowadays, most people consider mercantilism to be an outmoded economic doctrine. The forces of supply and demand in the market economy have now supplanted this idea in today's global economic environment.

19.2 Mercantilism–A Brief Survey

The nation-state first appeared sometime in the 16th century, and this is when the idea of mercantilism first emerged. The prevailing economic theory said that because there was a limited amount of money in the world, it was better for the country to amass as much as it could. At that time, a nation's worth was determined by how much silver and gold it had. In order to increase their riches, European nations like Britain and France would concentrate on increasing their exports while reducing their imports, which led to a favourable trade balance. The difference would be repaid in silver or gold for nations with a negative trade balance with a mercantilist nation. The early mercantilist governments would implement imperialist strategies by founding colonies in less developed countries in order to preserve a favourable trade balance. The objective was to remove raw materials to be sent home, where they would be processed into produced goods. Following a successful trade balance, the products would be resold to the colonies, enabling the early mercantilist countries to amass wealth.

19.3 16th century Europe–The Atlantic Revolution

Europe witnessed a rapid change in various sectors during the 16th century. The medieval practices were rapidly abandoned and the features of modern capitalist culture were taking shapes. A shift from Mediterranean region to Atlantic Ocean was the most important economic feature of the said period. This economic shift was mostly responsible to originate a new economic ideology called Mercantilism. It created the contextual background for the outcome of the mercantile theory. European traders had set up marine trading networks by the early 17th century that extended

eastward to India and China and across the Atlantic Ocean. Through these networks, they were able to purchase spices, tea, sugar, furs, and other high-end goods that were in high demand across Europe. In the Americas, European settlers began using large numbers of enslaved Africans to grow labour-intensive crops such as sugarcane and tobacco for export to Europe. Many of these slaves were purchased by Portuguese and then Dutch traders from trading ports along the coast of West Africa. After the slaves were sold in the Americas, traders used the money to buy regional goods to export to Europe. Up until the 1800s, this cyclical trade pattern dominated the Atlantic region's economy. European countries guarded their trade networks against competing governments with great care. For instance, the Dutch East India Company had a private army and navy that it employed to protect its commercial relations with India and Southeast Asia. Global trade changed the way that people produce and consume goods around the world, which helped England and the Netherlands develop quickly at the expense of more established colonial powers like Spain and Portugal.

The Portuguese cornered the lucrative trade in eastern spices in the 16th century, to the detriment of Venice, which had previously had a virtual monopoly on these valuable commodities. Up until that point, the Venetians had transported these commodities overland through India and Arabia, then across the Mediterranean for distribution in western Europe. Early explorers of the east African coast who had bases in Mozambique and Zanzibar left Portugal. By seizing and strengthening Hormuz at the mouth of the Persian Gulf in 1514, Goa on the west coast of India in 1510, and Malacca, which was manning the route's narrowest waterway in 1511, Albuquerque expands this safe route eastward. In 1534, Bombay Island was given to the Portuguese. The Portuguese presence in Sri Lanka increased rapidly during the century. The Portuguese merchants were also able to establish a colony on the island of Macao in 1557. From the very beginning Goa functioned as the capital of Portuguese India.

Portugal held a monopoly on the eastern spice trade thanks to this network of fortified ports and the absence of any ships in the Indian Ocean that may have posed a threat to her supremacy at sea. In fact, the English believed that their only chance of trading with the Far East was to locate a passage north of Russia as they were already building their own interests in ocean commerce. Early attempts to discover

a northeast passage led to the formation of one of the first joint-stock companies, the Muscovy Company, which was incorporated in 1555. Spain, one of the other Atlantic maritime powers, was primarily focused on its obligations to the United States and the trade with Portugal directly benefitted the Dutch. Their vessels were the only ones allowed to transport the priceless eastern commodities from Lisbon to northern Europe. When the Spanish invaded Portugal in 1580, the situation abruptly changed. Lisbon took over running the Portuguese empire after the Spanish departed, but the political shift itself had no negative effects on Portugal's commercial interests. Now that they had lost their portion of the eastern commerce, the Dutch decided to establish their own economic network. Their initial thought, like the English, was to search for a northeast passage (a task which takes Willem Barents into uncharted waters). However, they determined in 1595 that confronting the Portuguese on the southern road was their best plan of action. It was a choice that had a significant impact on trade in the east. However, in the near term, more trade was now being conducted by Spain across the Atlantic.

Silver was primarily responsible for the prosperity of Spain's new colonies in Latin America. At Potos, in present-day Bolivia, a vast source of the metal was discovered in 1545. This high Andean region was so rich in silver and tin that it could potentially have 5000 active mines. A year after the finding at Potos, silver was discovered in Mexico at Zacatecas. In the coming years, Mexico would continue to produce significant amounts of new metal sources. Gold sources were also being tapped, albeit in considerably smaller quantities. Spanish caravel consignments transported the valuable bullion used by the colonists to make their payments back to Spain after delivering the European commodities required in the colonies to Portobelo. The colonists also had to pay their dues to the Spanish crown i.e. 20 % of all gold and silver.

These treasures attracted privateers from northern Europe - meaning privately owned vessels operating, even if informally, on behalf of a government. Their captains were drawn to the Spanish Main (the mainland of Spanish America, where the ships dock) like wasps to a honey pot. Sailors from England, such as Francis Drake, preyed on the Spanish fleets in what is effectively a programme of national piracy. At the Spanish end, all trade had to be channelled through the official Casa de Contratación (House of Trade) established in Seville in 1503. As a result of this

monopoly, Seville enjoyed increased affluence, which then extended throughout the rest of Europe. Spain as a whole, including the Seville region, was unable to supply all the products needed by the colonists. Far-flung places send raw materials and manufactured commodities to Seville for shipping to America. A pressure toward inflation was already present in 16th-century Europe due to various factors. The Spanish bullion also contributed to the increase in price.

The rich fish stocks in the waters near Newfoundland came to the attention of Europeans with John Cabot's expedition in 1497. Soon, European nations with access to the Atlantic started sending fishing fleets there every year to gather cod. Large quantities of salt were carried with them. On the Newfoundland coasts, summer towns were built to process the fish before it was shipped back to European markets in the fall.

Humphrey Gilbert legally annexed Newfoundland in 1583 on behalf of the English queen as England took the lead in the trade. It was a claim that was not uncontested, especially by France, whose ships were the English's major competitors in these waters.

19.4 National monarchy and economic nationalism

The harmony that most of Western, Southern, and Eastern Europe had known under the Roman Empire had been destroyed by the Feudal System. After Rome fell, Europe was split up into local and regional political and economic units, each of which operated politically and survived economically in varying degrees of isolation from the others. But starting in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, forces started to emerge that started to turn this around. Kings and princes were keen to reduce the influence and power of the nobility at the local and regional levels in order to consolidate power in their own hands as "absolute" rulers.

As new nation-states emerged under the rule of kings, particularly in France, Spain, and Great Britain, mercantilism emerged as a set of economic measures to aid in the centralization of political power and authority. In these nations, the procedure was carried out in a variety of ways and to varying degrees. Since the tactics and technologies of the day allowed for this consolidation of power in the hands of kings,

monarchies in Spain and France almost became "absolute." The nobility in Great Britain had a long history of fighting against losing their "traditional" rights and privileges, preventing this from occurring to the same extent as in these other countries.

It was assumed that the king's administration had both the right and duty to regulate and oversee the economic activities of the sovereign's subjects under the Mercantilist view of the nation-state and of society in general. The people and the lands in these nations were seen as the king's property, which he might use and dispose of however he thought would benefit his interests. The state's power was used to forbid trade the king disapproved of, compel producers to produce goods the monarch deemed desirable, and to sell them at prices the king deemed "just" and "fair" in order to prevent the king's subjects from freely trading with buyers and sellers in other nations. The kings of France, perhaps, were the most keen to impose and enforce the Mercantilist policy.

Mercantilism of the 16th century transformed the earlier concepts of the smaller economic units of towns or guilds to the level of the entire state. It did not represent a complete change but gave clear indication that thinkers, administrators and the government of the new states in Europe had brought some coherence to their ideas on economic subjects. With the expansion of the trade and the declining revenues of the feudal states, with the emergence of centralized monarchies and larger and more luxurious courts, the rising states understood the benefits of trade, which increased wealth and state revenue. It was thought that the rulers owned the same wealth as their subjects. This led to active government intervention in economy and political matters and became the central feature of all mercantilist ideas. The chief task of the government was to regulate the economic life of the subjects according to their own ideas. However, the policies adopted by different states varied according to the economic and social conditions prevalent in each state. For mercantilist ideas to succeed, a reasonable development of trade and commerce was necessary. Hence, it can be said that the mercantilist policies and practices could only be adopted in states that had strong governments and a reasonably well-developed trade. It was aimed at strengthening the centralized state structure by weakening and regulating semi-independent local authorities.

19.5 Conclusion

Thus mercantilism helped the national or absolute monarchy to gain more strength. Richard Dunn has correctly observed 'that mercantilists were always patriots'. In the beginning the policies of the mercantilist state revealed a wave of nationalism–a desire to defend the frontiers by customs tolls. In the 14th century, Castile forbade the exports of grain and livestock. France placed an embargo on grain exports in 1305 and 1307; Aragon introduced navigation laws that aimed at controlling foreign trade, while the English placed restrictions on the import of iron in 1355. Thus it will not be an exaggeration to say that the mercantilism was a product of its contemporary condition and it was not a unique idea of 16th century Europe. We can conclude with the lines of Braudel, 'there was nothing new about the major decisions of classic mercantilism'.

19.6 Model Questions

1. Trace the origin of Mercantilism.
2. What were the causes behind the rise of the mercantile concept?
3. Explain the Atlantic Revolution.
4. How did mercantilism emerge as a set of economic measures to aid in the centralization of political power of monarchs in Europe.

19.7 Suggested Readings

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe in Transition*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Magnusson, Lars. *Mercantilism: the Shaping of an Economic Language*, London, 1994.

Rich, E. E. & C. H. Wilson, *Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, vol. IV, Cambridge, 1967.

Unit 20 ❑ The Theory of Mercantilism

Structure

20.0 Objectives

20.1 Introduction

20.2 Main features of Mercantilism

20.2.1 Concept of wealth – Bullionism

20.2.2 Balance of Trade

20.2.3 Mining, Manufacturing and Industry

20.2.4 Natural Resources

20.2.5 Factors of Production

20.2.6 Commercial Regulation

20.2.7 Role of State

20.2.8 Taxation

20.2.9 Theory of Value

20.3 Colony and Mercantilism

20.4 Conclusion

20.5 Model Questions

20.6 Suggested Readings

20.0 Objectives

- The unit is a continuation of the previous one where origin of mercantilism has been discussed.
- The present unit will focus on the various features of mercantilism such as bullionism, balance of trade, mining, manufacturing and industry, natural resources, factors of production, commercialization, role of state, taxation, theory of value.

20.1 Introduction

Mercantilism was the main school of economic theory in Europe from the 16th through the 18th centuries. In many nations, it was known by various names. Since it emphasised the value of commerce and free trade, it was known as the commercial system or mercantile system in England. Again since its actual policies included several limits and prohibitions on commerce, it was also known as the "Restrictive system." It was referred to as "Colbertism" in France after Colbert, Louis XIV's Finance Minister. It was known as "Cameralism" in Germany and Austria. Due to the significance placed on gold and silver, it was sometimes referred to as "Bullionism." Along with England, France, Germany, and Italy, mercantilism was also prevalent in Scotland, Spain, and Russia. It adapted to the alterations in the environment. "It had three hundred years run and so it affected the thought and furthermore the deeds of every country in Europe," wrote Alexander Grey. "Mercantilism contains the economic doctrines that predominated among European policymakers from the 16th to the 18th century," according to Haney.

20.2 Main features of Mercantilism

The Mercantilist ideas emphasized government stimulation, supervision and protection of the state's economy. It was directly intended to increase the power of the state. It held that the power of a state depended on the actual and calculable wealth which could be represented only through gold and silver bullion. For accumulation of this bullion the state needs unity and absolute power. This Mercantile concept is commonly known as the etatism.

20.2.1 Concept of wealth–Bullionism

The idea of bullionism is the key component of Mercantilism. Making a nation strong was the main goal of mercantilism. The wealth of a nation was used to gauge its power, particularly that percentage of the wealth made up of precious metals like gold and silver. Therefore, bullion (gold) was given more significance by the Mercantilists since it was the most resilient, practical, and socially acceptable kind

of wealth. The fundamental tenet of mercantilism was that wealth and power were based on gold. Therefore, "more gold, more money, and more power" was the mercantilist catch phrase. The focus of all economic activity in the nation was wealth. In this regard, it appears that the mercantilists should have looked to their forefathers for inspiration, as power was equated with the collection of treasure or precious metals in ancient Greek and Roman culture as well as throughout the Middle Ages. This bullion-centric mania grew as a result of a number of crucial elements. Gold and silver were the only types of wealth that were widely seen as useful and acceptable in the 16th century. Naturally, gold and silver were given additional prominence by the mercantilist. Taxation was only feasible with the development of absolute monarchy if money was utilised as a standard of worth. As a result, money also started to play a bigger role in politics. Money was necessary for fighting wars. The mercantilists held that trade required an abundance of money. Additionally, money was required for the growth of the trade economy. Back then, capital was synonymous with money.

The importance of gold and silver increased with the discovery of new lands. As the Spanish empire expanded and dominated Europe after its conquest of the new world and reached in its pinnacle of glory in the 16th century, it was believed by most economic writers and policy makers that the real reason behind the Spanish success was the availability of bullion. In fact the conquest and subsequent plundering of the American colonies by Spain is the best example of mercantilism at work on a large scale. The vast supply of silver to Spain was regarded as a major windfall and many European governments wished to follow the Spanish example in their search for new colonies. Antonio Serra in his monumental work '*Brief Discourse on a Possible Means of Causing Gold and Silver Abound in Kingdoms Where there are No Mines'* suggested large scale export of manufactured commodities, which would bring gold and silver into the kingdom. In many states the export of coins and bullion was not encouraged. In France, Jacques Coeur was severally criticized for allegedly sending money out of the kingdom. Drain of silver from England also became a major subject of debate between the supporters and opponents of the English East India Company. As a result, the Mercantilists valued money highly. Given the conditions of the time, Mercantilists were justified in placing a higher value on gold. "The Mercantilists

acknowledged the crucial role of money in the economic system," according to Keynes. They investigated the effects of increased money supply on the price level and employment." The Mercantilists therefore valued money highly. If we take into account the historical context, Mercantilists were justified in placing a higher value on gold. The Mercantilists "recognised the vital role of money in the economic system," according to Keynes and they investigated how an increase in money supply would affect employment and price levels.

20.2.2 Balance of Trade

The Balance of Trade was Mercantilism's second crucial idea. The balance of trade theory is another name for the Mercantilist theory of international commerce. This hypothesis was designed to obtain significant quantities of precious metals. Silver and gold were thought to only be obtained through international trade. They thought that by trading for gold and silver from other nations, all those countries that lacked their own gold and silver mines might become wealthy. Sir Thomas Mun the greatest representative of Mercantilist declared that, "foreign trade ought to be encouraged, for, upon it hinges the great revenue of the King, the honour of the kingdom, the noble profession of the merchant, the supply of our poor, the improvement of our lands and means of our treasure". The mercantilists maintained that exports should always outweigh imports in value. They supported a favourable trade balance, to put it briefly.

As a result, they promoted exports while discouraging imports. The core of this approach was "export more, import less, and collect the balance in the form of gold and silver." As a result, each exporter was viewed as a close ally of the state and each importer as an adversary. The mercantilist philosophy of international trade, however, is no longer relevant. International trade would cease if every country increased its exports. Additionally, the mercantilists did not differentiate between the specific and overall balance of trade. By general balance of commerce, we mean the harmony between the nation's trade with other nations and with a specific nation. Additionally, the mercantilists were unaware that a favourable balance of trade could not last forever because inflation would result from an increase in gold imports into a nation. As a result, the mercantilist idea of international trade was incorrect.

20.2.3 Mining, Manufacturing and Industry

Among the European mercantile states emphasis on mining, manufacturing and industry was common. The mercantilists considered commerce and industry as the most important branches of the national economy. They wanted to increase the national productive efficiency by means of regulation of industry and commerce. They believed that commerce and trade were the most productive occupation and agriculture was the least productive. As they believed that manufacturing industries were more closely connected with commerce, they must receive all attention from the government. To be self-sufficient, it was believed that a country must produce every kind of manufactured goods. It must nurture and protect its industries and start new industries by giving concessions and favours to those who contributed in their objective.

However, it should not be misunderstood that the mercantilists regarded agriculture as insignificant. They thought that agriculture did not contribute directly to the strength of the country. Agriculture was given importance primarily to encourage the production raw materials, such as wool, flax, silk or hemp, for the industries.

20.2.4 Natural Resources

The mercantilists wanted to utilize all the natural resources to the maximum extent so as to produce more, export more and import less. They also attached importance to agriculture in order to solve the food problem. Colonies were developed to supply the required raw materials. Further, the colonies were not allowed to export directly to foreign countries. All the commodities should be exported to the mother country only.

20.2.5 Factors of Production

Mercantilists recognised three important factors of production, namely, land, labour and capital. Here we can quote Sir William Petty's saying "Labour is the father and active principle of wealth as land is the mother". The Mercantilists emphasised the cultivation of agricultural waste lands so that food production might increase and the country might become self-sufficient and imports might be reduced.

20.2.6 Commercial Regulation

Mercantilists believed that commercial regulations were essential for maximising social welfare. Commercial laws were passed to restrict the import of food materials. But no regulation was applied to the import of raw materials because they were required for the industrial development of the country. The state supported the export industries and shipping which would secure a favourable balance of trade.

20.2.7 Role of State

The mercantilists regarded the state as the supreme power for controlling the activities of the people. State was the master and its citizens, the servants. The mercantilists believed that state intervention was necessary to solve the problems of the society. They believed that for securing success in wars a strong nation was required. Nearly, all the mercantilist writers believed that since the total economic resources of the world were limited, the economic policy must be framed in such a manner as to increase the power of the state. As a result they suggested the policy of protection. The state policies were shaped according to this idea. Special acts were passed to encourage exports and the development of industries. Protection was given to the industries because their main objective was to maintain a favourable balance of trade.

20.2.8 Taxation

The views of the mercantilists on taxation were interesting because they were more scientific and ahead of their time. Broadly speaking the mercantilists favoured a multiple tax system based on the principle of "each should pay according to the benefits received from the state".

20.2.9 Theory of Value

Regarding value, both subjective and objective approaches existed. Prior to the mercantilists, value was regarded as an intrinsic quality possessed by a commodity; it depended upon the utility of the commodity. Value was thus considered to be different from price. By the end of the mercantilist period, market value was

recognised. Scarcity also determined the value of a commodity. According to the mercantilists the normal value of a commodity depended on the cost of production.

20.3 Colony and Mercantilism

The mercantilists also emphasized the role of colonies. In fact mercantilism to a large extent developed as a result of the colonial empires. The mercantilists had discovered the south for new wealth. For a mercantilist colonies were important for several reasons. They provided market for the manufactured products of the country and produced raw materials that could not be produced at home. Colonies also became an important basis for trade and a source of employment. They added to the prestige of a country and hence we notice that a large number of European countries from the 16th century constantly endeavoured to create their own colonies by reaching out to new lands. Mercantilist ideas and practices resulted in a series of colonial wars among the European powers. The three naval wars between England and Holland and another three wars between France and Holland were primarily caused by mercantilist ideas. Closely associated with this aspect was the importance of sea power. To send goods to foreign markets and to control distant regions, a country required a large number of merchant ships. Moreover, to implement tariff regulations and to protect sea trade against foreigners and pirates, a powerful navy was considered important to threaten opponents, to open up new markets and to enhance the prestige of a country. The French ministers, Richelieu and Colbert made special efforts to develop the French navy during the 17th century. It was with this navy that France was able to challenge English supremacy over the seas throughout the 18th century.

20.4 Conclusion

Mercantile theory dominated the European economy for a long time. Although it was very popular for time being because of its patriotic flavour but Mercantilist theories and practices have been criticised by many writers. In reality, opposition began toward the end of the 17th century. In France, the backlash against mercantilism was particularly fierce. Around the turn of the 19th century, Adam Smith produced

'The Wealth of Nations', a book with one-fourth of its pages devoted to criticism of mercantilism.

20.5 Model Questions

1. Name the main features of mercantilism.
2. Examine the focus on bullionism in European economy.
3. Why was Balance of Trade regarded as an important characteristic of the mercantilist theory?
4. Elucidate the role of mining, manufacturing and industry in the pre-modern European economic structure.
5. What was the function of the state in mercantilism?
6. Trace the relationship between colony and the concept of Mercantilism.

20.6 Suggested Readings

Horrocks, J.W. *A Short History of Mercantilism*, Routledge, 2018.

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe in Transition*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Magnusson, Lars. *Mercantilism: the Shaping of an Economic Language*, London, 1994.

Rich, E. E. & C. H. Wilson, *Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, vol. IV, Cambridge, 1967.

Unit 21 ❑ (a) Mercantilism in Action; (b) Rejection of Mercantilism

Structure (a) & (b)

21.0 Objectives

21.1 Introduction

21.2 Regional Variations of Mercantilism in Action

21.3 The Rejection of Mercantilism

21.4 Conclusion

21.5 Model Questions

21.6 Suggested Readings

21.0 Objectives

At the end of the unit the earner will know about:

- The regional variations of Mercantilism in Portugal, Spain, France and England
- Criticism of the theory of Mercantilism

21.1 Introduction

Trade economics known as mercantilism was practised from the 16th through the 18th centuries. Due to the mercantilist belief that wealth in the world remained constant, many European countries sought to amass the maximum possible portion of that riches by increasing their exports and reducing their imports through tariffs.

21.2 Regional Variations of Mercantilism in Action

Mercantile theory had many regional variations. Almost every European state had its own concept of Mercantilism and they followed mercantile or semi mercantile policies in accordance with its own economic strengths and needs.

Venice and Genoa were perhaps the earliest states which followed some sort of mercantile policies. They had established powerful control over trade which came through the eastern land route. The luxury goods that were transported over the Mediterranean Sea were strictly regulated by the Venetian authority. Foreign traders were not allowed to conduct business within the state, and a state monopoly on trade was established. No other European nation could challenge the dominance of the Venetians since they also established a sizable fleet of tiny ships. The Portuguese activity in the sea and the discovery of new areas, however, caused the Venetian dominance to be eclipsed around the end of the 15th century.

The economic interest of Portugal was related mainly to Africa and Asia. The Portuguese under Royal supervision had carried out sea explorations for new trade. The trade was carried on by the Royal ships or by merchants who were given license by the king. The new spice trade, along the sea route became a Royal monopoly supervised by Royal officers. The king strictly controlled the pepper trade, and the capital and the resources were provided by the crown. This monopoly enabled the king to by pepper at a very low cost and to sell it to the merchants outside Portugal at an exorbitant price. Although Portugal remained under Spanish rule from 1580-1640 and the Portuguese interest were subordinated to Spain, the Portuguese trade ventures continued, though later Portugal lost its monopoly in the eastern seas. During the 16th century the crown monopoly remained effective which resulted in the certain of the first overseas empire by a European state. To retain control over the sources of luxury trade, the Portuguese used naval gunnery and kept all knowledge of sea navigation a closely guarded secret. The early success of the Portuguese directed by the crown opened the way for other European powers.

The Spanish empire of the 16th century was the first great mercantile state and at the same time, it was the last great Catholic crusading state. In Spain, certain mercantile tendencies could be noticed from the 13th century itself. Their ruler Alfonso X placed restrictions on the export of gold and silver in 1268. This was continued in the 14th and 15th centuries also. Death penalty could be awarded to a person for sending bullion or coin out of the country by a law of 1471. However, despite legislative measures the efforts of the state failed because the Spanish crown remained financially starved and borrowed from outside sources at high interest rates, which drained money from the country.

The Spanish crown adopted strict mercantile legislation to retain monopoly control over the American colonies. This in fact was the best illustration of Mercantile ideas and practices. All the colonies were divided into different categories to be ruled directly or indirectly by Spain. The Royal council of Indies was created to supervise the distant colonies and Casa d Contratacion was founded in 1503 to regulate colonial trade. The twin objectives of protecting and monopolising colonial trade and the state decision to ensure that bullion reached Spain directly, led to a series of restrictive policies and a rigid system of controls. The government imposed alcabala or sales tax which was collected by the crown. Even products like wine, vinegar, meat and oil were placed under excise tax. It is generally argued that such restrictions adversely affected the economic growth of Spain and prevented the accumulation of capital in the hands of merchants. However, the Spanish shipping industry had grown enormously because of colonial requirements. But it was not able to manage the colonial trade by itself, despite the crown monopoly and the foreign merchants benefited from this situation.

The foundation of French mercantilist philosophy was a political speech tradition that was very different from that of England. French mercantilism developed from an absolutist political theory that held that the state was the only institution capable of bringing together the diverse wills that make up civil society, in contrast to English mercantilism, which was initially based on a Commonwealth tradition of political thought that saw the health and stability of the state as dependent upon economic relations within an agriculturally dominant civil society. In English mercantilism, civil society's economic ties played a significant role in ensuring the stability and prosperity of the state; in French mercantilism, the state was responsible for ensuring the harmony and cohesion of civil society.

The varied historical trajectories that English and French society took to emerge from the feudal crises covered in the preceding chapter were represented in these differing philosophical orientations. The push for absolutism in France created an explosive tension between centrifugal and centripetal interests, unlike England where the state had significantly changed into an institution that represented the self-organization of landed gentlemen. In England, the constitutional monarchy reflected the self-centralization of the ruling class in a very concrete form; in France,

centralization came first as a result of the Crown's ongoing conflict with the historically dominating segments of civil society.

In a series of dramatic events in the course of nearly a century, an increasing number of French social thinkers were compelled to think in line of absolutist political theory and its mercantilist political economy. In the second half of the sixteenth century, the civil wars provoked men like Bodin to put their weight behind an absolutist-mercantilist concept of state and society. There were huge peasant rebellions in 1578, 1580, and all throughout the 1590s that united the ruling class against threat from the common subjects.

Additionally, Third Estate members frequently appealed to the monarchy to rein in the exorbitant privileges enjoyed by the nobility. The gruelling Thirty Years' War also revealed a state's military frailty due to internal strife. The Fronde crisis also showed that no segment of society outside of the court was capable of forming a cohesive political force. The fight for a piece of the centralised feudal rent that the state had appropriated engaged all facets of the ruling elite and those wanting to join it. For many of their contemporaries, only the monarchy offered a potential manifestation of the collective will; it seemed to be above the rampant particularity that was destroying French society.

Political philosophy started to think of the state as the active presence that creates the unity of civil society as a result. In the broad context of such a doctrine, French mercantilism first appeared. A key prerequisite for the reconstruction of state power was considered as economic prosperity. Additionally, in a society where the bourgeoisie and the majority of the aristocracy made their fortunes by obtaining political positions that granted them access to a portion of the centralised feudal rent, the duty of fostering industry and commerce looked to fall to the state itself. As a result, while English mercantilist theory and the policies that accompanied it were developed by merchants in the seventeenth century, French mercantilism was essentially a product of royal officials.

This aspect makes it particularly challenging to interpret French mercantilism. For when we are dealing with individuals like Richelieu and Colbert, it is quite challenging to distinguish between theory and policy. These were not theorists; they were statesmen. They were primarily aspirational and pragmatist political actors.

However, they were not purely utilitarian pragmatists. In actuality, they worked with an established body of ideas that had absolutist thinking as their source. The fact that French mercantilism was in fact, in a very real sense, a subset of absolutist political theory has prevented many scholars from distinguishing between the two doctrines and has led some to associate French mercantilism solely and simply with state building.

In the minds of men like Bodin and Montchrétien, the notions of an indivisible source of political authority and of national economic self-sufficiency were inseparable. A strong state, capable of waging both military and economic warfare, had to be capable of administering the economy as a whole, even intervening directly in the economic activities of individuals; its centralized political authority had to be able to command the economic resources of the kingdom, to sustain itself. The central state, in other words, had to be both economically and politically self-sufficient.

In political theory, absolutism placed the state above the moral standards of Christianity, which were thought to control interpersonal relationships. Absolutist theorists frequently borrowed Descartes' atomic or corpuscular theory of matter to create a theory of the state and society in response to the fractured body politic that resulted from clashing and competing private interests. They believed that the morals regulating people did not apply to the state. To establish order on the atomic constituents of society was the moral goal of the state.This is why some absolutist theorists openly defended Machiavelli's political beliefs (as did Richelieu). The highest form of human goodness was the concord of society and the unity of the state. Any activities that upheld or furthered that harmony and unification were morally justifiable as "reasons of state." Given that all measures were legitimate in the pursuit or defence of the sovereignty of the state, this could—and frequently did—inspire violence against the king's subjects as well as against foreign countries. The absolute monarch needed exclusive control over the nation's resources just as he needed sovereign authority over his citizens. The economy was seen by French mercantilism as an extension of the aristocracy. Because of this, the French, not the English, are credited with coining the term "political economy." The term first appeared in Antoyne de Montchrétien's 'Traicté de l'oéconomie politico' in 1615 as the title of a work. The goal of Montchrétien's 'Traicté' is to administer the national

economy more effectively. The principles appropriate to the royal household's financial organisation are thought to extend to state administration of the economy.

A legacy of mercantilist economic discourse that extended the Greek concept of oikonomia (the economic administration of the family) to issues with public finances was established in France by Montchrétien's 'Traicté'. Therefore, it was necessary to make a distinction between private economy, which refers to family management, and public or political economy, which refers to the management of the national economy as seen as an outgrowth of the royal household. The state was designated as the primary unit of economic analysis by French mercantilism. In fact, it combined the ideas of the economy and the state; the phrase "political economy" suggested an unbreakable connection between the two and designated "economics" as a branch of politics.

From the perspective of the royal household's financial troubles, economic challenges were seen. Additionally, a patriarchal conception of the economy's structure existed. The king was viewed as the kind master who guided and controlled economic activities for the benefit of the political family as a whole. This viewpoint first appeared in its basic form in Montchretien's 'Traicté', the central work of French mercantilist political economy.

The fundamental tenet of Montchrétien's philosophy was that France had to achieve economic self-sufficiency. Montchrétien shared the view of the majority of old French mercantilists that France was uniquely able to meet all of her economic demands while other countries were dependent on France's agricultural exports. As a result, the development of home industry might reduce imports without affecting French exports in any manner. Additionally, a decrease in imports would automatically increase the country's wealth under the assumption that there is inelastic demand for French exports since profit can only be achieved through foreign commerce (since internal trade is unprofitable for the country as a whole).

With very few exceptions, Montchrétien tends to associate wealth with gold and money in accordance with classic bullionist theory. As a result, the 'Traicté' places a strong emphasis on fostering business and industry. It's not like Montchrétien downplayed the value of agriculture. Instead, he asserted that the most essential and fundamental sector of the economy is agriculture. However, industry is the dynamic

sector that alone can help to increase national income by reducing imports and creating a positive trade balance—a idea that runs throughout Montchrétien's entire argument.

The 'Traicté' is based on the principle of economic self-sufficiency. France may be able to regain its complete dominance through moral and economic reform. Therefore, Montchrétien advanced a system of interconnected concepts: economic self-sufficiency, protection, national development, a positive trade balance, tax reform, and encouragement of industry, commerce, navigation, and colonialism were to fit together as components of a coordinated programme of economic reform. Additionally, the monarch was to be the driving force behind this transition by applying the fundamental tenants of the home economy in its broadest sense.

This prognosis was predicated on an idea of the European economy that was largely unchanging. Colbert asserted that essential economic resources, such as ships and gold, were available in set numbers. As a result, only the decline of another nation may lead to an increase in the wealth of another. Therefore, a nation could only increase its riches and influence by bringing in money from other countries. Everyone agrees, according to Colbert, that a state's grandeur and power can only be increased by an abundance of money in that state. Thus, limiting imports must be the goal of French economic policy in order to preserve a favourable trade balance.

Colbert started working tirelessly to put this idea into practise with his policies. He raised tariffs on imported goods, provided the hothouse industry with significant financial incentives, set up international trading firms, and expanded the fleet. The controller general experienced opposition in each of these regions. Colbert became an extreme absolutist as a result of having to deal with criticism of his policies. He railed against all sorts of localism, historical rights, and feudal privileges since they made it difficult for him to plan and run the country's economy. He became more and more reliant on the intendants, the royal agents Richelieu appointed to serve as the Crown's representatives in the provinces. Colbert had a strong hatred for any particular interests that stood in the way of advancing what, in his opinion, was in the best interest of the state. Hence, he had a strong dislike for merchants, in contrast to certain interpretations that saw the controller general as a representative of the bourgeoisie. Despite Colbert's efforts to advance society as a whole, his initiatives

were faced with a rising tide of criticism. The controller general was eventually blamed for the aristocracy's, merchants', and impoverished people's specific complaints, such as the collapse of trade, starvation, or intolerably high tax assessments. The intensity of this antagonism was reflected in the frenzy of celebration that erupted through Paris in the wake of Colbert's passing in 1683.

The salient features of English mercantilism continued to shift from the end of the 15th to the late 18th centuries. These included emphasis on bullionism and balance of trade and commerce, regulation of domestic industries and manufacturing activities and from the second half of the 17th century, the mercantile emphasis shifted to navigation laws and colonial regulations. Thus, every aspects of economic life was stimulated and regulated by the central government.

In 1621, Thomas Mun's Discourse on English Trade with the East Indies reflected the mercantile spirit and emphasized the importance of foreign trade in this work. In England's treasury by foreign trade, Thomas Mun wrote on the value of foreign trade stressed that it provided great revenue to the king and brought honour to the kingdom. It help the merchants and the schools of arts, satisfied English wants, provided employment to the poor and brought improvement in economy. During Oliver Cromwell's time mercantile policies were followed with greater vigor. In 1651, the first navigation act was implemented to established English supremacy over the neighboring waters. This act insighted that European goods could be only transported on English ships or ships belonging the importing country. This implied that goods from colonies could only be carried in English ships as the colonies did not possesses their own ships. The second and third navigation acts led to a naval war that destroyed the commercial supremacy of the Netherlands. 18th century England witnessed increasing regulations over the English colonies.

As France was pursuing a similar policy, it resulted in a series of colonial wars between the two countries and hastened the process of colonisation in different parts of the world. The American independence was also the result of this rivalry to a great extent. It was under the guidance of Sir George Downing, who is at times called the architect of the English mercantile system, that trade between England and the colonies was strongly enclosed, protected and channelized in English shipping. Instead of a direct ban on the export of treasure, as seen in the old attempts, the

emphasis now shifted to increasing the volume and value of exports, reducing the volume and value of imports carried in foreign owned ships and by receiving income from fright through British ships as far as possible. Thus, we find, the emphasis in English mercantilism changed with the passage of time and with economic development of the country.

21.3 The Rejection of Mercantilism

Numerous authors have criticised mercantilist views and methods. In reality, opposition began toward the end of the 17th century. In France, the backlash against mercantilism was particularly fierce. Around the turn of the 19th century, Adam Smith produced "The Wealth of Nations," a book with one-fourth of its pages devoted to criticism of mercantilism.

The expansion of the world market and advent of a system of international lending and credit, and of multilateral payments reduced the anxiety over bullion resources. This began to happened during the 18th century. Nicholas Barbon contested that it is not important to have a large supply of bullion but rather a great stock of useful goods because the value of money lies in its utility as a medium of exchange and not because of its intrinsic value. While emphasising on the need for maintaining the monopoly of the East India trade because of the peculiar difficulties attached to it, Joshua Child advocated freedom of commerce for other regions. He also disapproved of certain mercantile legislation. Charles Davenant strongly criticized the Whig government for restricting trade with France, but he defended the navigational acts and the export of bullion by English companies. France experienced similar criticism of the theory and policy of Mercantilism in the 18th century. One of the most important form of criticism came from the writings of Pierre le Pesant de Boisguilbert.

Two important economic ideas emerged during the 18th century - the idea od laissez faire in England and a group of scholars called the Physiocrats in France. These new ideas on economy played a crucial role in the ultimate enfeeblement of the Mercantile system in Europe.

21.4 Conclusion

It did not have widespread applicability as an economic strategy. As a collection of doctrines, it was unable to offer the appropriate direction to the rulers of the day. They overemphasised the significance of bullion, which led them to mistake the goals with the means. In addition, they saw money and labour as the end purpose of human existence in their effort to boost the nation's overall production.

In addition to being effective managers and dealers, mercantilists advanced concepts that helped shape a number of contemporary economic theories. As Dr. Smith correctly noted, "The mercantilists, not Smith, are the intellectual forebears of modern economics." Mercantilism implied a broader understanding of society, which is frequently disregarded. They created a kind of macro-economic strategy to solve societal issues.

The mercantilists emphasised the need to maximise exports in the hopes that a thriving export sector would provide employment in addition to the goal of amassing gold and silver. Even the mercantilists' insistence on making more money can be supported by economic arguments. They were conscious of the changing roles that money plays.

Lower interest rates would encourage investment since they would be caused by a rise in the money supply. Knut Wicksell used mercantilist principles as the foundation for the development of his theory of interest. Keynes was also a fan of some mercantilist concepts. The mercantilists understood that money serves as a store of value as well as a means of exchange.

Keynes observed that the mercantilists were engaged in ensuring the best possible use of the resources and were concerned with the economic system as a whole. Keynes endorsed two mercantilist ideas: more funding for corporate growth and more funding for decreasing interest rates.

Many western countries' transition from "commercial capitalism" to "industrial capitalism" was facilitated by mercantilism. Even now, the mercantilist ideals are influential. They all periodically return in different guises as signs and tools of economic strife, according to Eric Roll, "down to the current day."

So there were numerous reasons why mercantilism declined. Smith's teachings caused the policy of plenty to start to take the place of the policy of power. The rise of banks diminished the value of coins and bullion. Additionally, the growth of the market economy demonstrated that assets such as homes, businesses, and machines were more significant than precious metals like gold and silver.

The Industrial Revolution's economic expansion led to a dependence on competition in society. It was realised that efficient use of natural resources and advancements in science and technology may boost the prosperity of all nations at the same time.

21.5 Model Questions

1. Write an essay on the regional variations of Mercantilism.
2. Do you agree that the Spanish empire of the 16th century was the first great mercantile state?
3. Why is it challenging to interpret French mercantilism.
4. In what way can Montchretien's Traicté, be described as the central work of French mercantilist political economy.
5. What were Thomas Mun's Discourse on English Trade
6. Write briefly about the rejection of the mercantile theory.

21.6 Suggested Readings

Mun, Thomas. *The Complete Works: Economics and Trade*, Newton Page, 2013.

Sinha, Arvind. *Europe in Transition*, New Delhi, 2013.

Phukan, Meenaxi. *Rise of the Modern West*, New Delhi, 2000.

Magnusson, Lars. *Mercantilism: the Shaping of an Economic Language*, London, 1994.

Rich, E. E. & C. H. Wilson, *Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, vol. IV, Cambridge, 1967.

Module V: European Politics in the 18th Century

Unit 22 ❑ (a) Parliamentary monarchy; (b) Patterns of Absolutism in Europe

Structure (a) & (b)

22.0 Objectives

22.1 Introduction

22.2 Parliamentary Monarchy

22.3 Patterns of Absolutism in Europe

22.3.1 Origin

22.3.2 Regional variations of Absolutism

22.3.3 Limitations

22.4 Conclusion

22.5 Model Questions

22.6 Suggested Readings

22.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit the learners will understand:

- The political concept and structure predominant in 18th century Europe.
- The meaning of Parliamentary monarchy and Absolutism
- The conceptual knowledge of both of these political systems.

22.1 Introduction

The eighteenth century saw intellectual, social, and political upheaval in Europe. Since the ideals of the previous 100 years were widely adopted in the 18th century,

this period is frequently referred to as the Age of Enlightenment. Calculus and mechanics, two relatively new disciplines in academia, started to have an impact on how people thought about how the cosmos functioned. In terms of politics, the theories of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, and others would give rise to a concept of democracy that would eventually displace the monarchical system of government in Europe. Adam Smith's economic theories would serve as the conceptual underpinning for the growth of modern capitalism by the turn of the century.

22.2 Parliamentary Monarchy

A monarchical type of government developed under a constitutional monarchy is known by the phrase "the Queen reigns but does not rule" originated under a constitutional monarchy, a system of government in which a king or queen reigns with restrictions on their power alongside a governing body (i.e., Parliament). The majority of constitutional monarchy have a legislative system, and depending on the constitution, the monarch may only have reserve powers or may have obligations that are solely ceremonial. They have a prime minister who is the head of government and has real political authority, who may have been directly or indirectly elected.

The executive power of a constitutional monarchy is vested in the head of state, as it is in the majority of republics. As a doctrine of civics, constitutional monarchy nowadays almost usually coexists with representative democracy and strikes a balance between complete faith in the political class and in properly bred and properly trained monarchs who have been raised for the position from infancy. The Prime Minister is the person in charge of running the country, despite the fact that the monarch or queen is recognised as the government's symbolic head.

Although restrictions on the monarch's power (referred to as "A Limited Monarchy") date back much further than that, as evidenced by our Magna Carta, the Glorious Revolution of 1688 resulted in a constitutional monarchy in Britain that was governed by laws like the Bill of Rights 1689 and the Act of Settlement 1701. It developed in England throughout history for a variety of complex reasons: occasionally because of a lack of strong leadership, and other times because of strong leaders who were short on funds and needed to address public concerns in order to get this

support. Since Magna Carta in 1215, the English have not held the "Divine Right of Kings" in high regard. The Stuart dynasty's abuse of power and attempts to bring the notion of "Divine Right" to England in the 17th century led the English to cast doubt on the king's authority and resurrect prior checks on executive power. In order to restrict the King's power, Parliament made numerous crucial decisions. They brought back the English system of impeachment, which made the king's ministers answerable for his decisions and subject to death for carrying out unpopular measures. Charles I was compelled to sign the Petition of Right, which reaffirmed that in order to implement new laws, taxes, etc., the King must first consult with Parliament. Charles I quickly disregarded the Petition of Right after signing it, which sparked the English Civil Wars and the final beheading of the monarch.

Future English rulers were informed by this that they did not possess absolute power. The Habeas Corpus was enacted by Parliament under Charles II's rule. According to the Habeas Corpus Act, the King must offer a trial to any prisoner he takes into custody. This stopped the King from simply imprisoning his opponents to get rid of them. Many individuals did not like James II's display of his Catholicism when he ascended to the throne. As a result, Parliament once more showed off its might by requesting William of Orange to depose the monarch. Coming from the Netherlands, William and his wife Mary deposed James II without a fight. It was referred to as the "Glorious Revolution." William and Mary fully supported the constitutional monarchy once they had taken the throne. Together, they ratified the Bill of Rights, which significantly reduced the king's power and increased the freedom of his subjects. John Locke was a proponent of constitutional monarchy. He declared that direct democracy was the ideal form of administration in his "Treatises on Government." He claimed that people had three basic rights and the capacity to govern themselves. Life, liberty, and property are these rights, and it is the role of the government to uphold these rights. He also penned the idea, which was used as justification for the American Revolution, that the people have the right to overthrow an unjust government.

Political parties and other movements like universal suffrage would eventually arise as a result of this mental growth. By the middle of the 20th century, Europe's political culture had changed to the extent that all constitutional monarchs were now

merely effective symbolic leaders with no real authority. The true rulers of the country had changed to be the democratically elected parliaments and its prime minister. In many instances, even the monarchs themselves, who historically occupied the highest positions in society and politics, were delegated the title of "servants of the people" to reflect the new, egalitarian reality constitutional system which acknowledges an elected or hereditary monarch as head of state. Modern constitutional monarchies usually implement the concept of trias politica or "separation of powers' ', where the monarch either is the head of the executive branch or simply has a ceremonial role. An absolute monarchy is one in which the monarch has unrestricted authority. An absolute monarchy may have a considerably different legal and political system than a constitutional monarchy.

In representative democracies that are constitutional monarchies, like the United Kingdom, the monarch may be regarded as the head of state but the prime minister, whose power derives directly or indirectly from elections, is head of government. Even though the majority of today's constitutional monarchs are representative democracies (thus the term "constitutional democratic monarchies"), this has not always been the case historically. As was the case in Italy, Japan, and Spain, as well as with military dictatorships, as is the case at the moment in Thailand, monarchs have coexisted with fascist or quasi-fascist constitutions.

22.3 Patterns of Absolutism in Europe

The Age of Absolutism was the period around the 16th and 18th centuries when Europe was ruled by some very powerful monarchs. Monarchs with absolute control. Thus, the Age of Absolutism. Absolute monarchs were rulers who held all the power in a country. Under their rule there were no checks and balances on their power, and there were no other governing bodies they shared the power with. These monarchs also ruled by the divine right theory or the belief that their power came directly from God so any opposition to them tantamount to opposing God.

It did not have a uniform appearance, although its social base remained more or less the same. It emerged from medieval feudal kingship, where powers were limited by the legislative and judicial rights of vassals, churches, semi-independent provinces

and municipal corporations. All these forces were represented in institutions called by different names in different states such as Estates General in France, Diet in the German states, Parliament in England and Cortes in Spain.

The absolute rulers began concentrating all authority in their hands by successfully raising standing armies and by creating royal bureaucracies directly under their own control, collecting taxes independently and formulating independent policies. All these developments transformed the physical, military, administrative and legal aspects of feudal states.

22.3.1 Origin

Absolutism originated from the crisis of feudalism. The existence of weak feudal states with fragmented sovereignty during the medieval period gave a semblance of stability but in the period of economic and political crises, the solution lay not in the continuation of such frail states but in the absorption and consolidation of smaller units into a strong centralized state. Absolutism was a response to this situation.

Gianfranco Poggi lists a number of reasons for the weakening of feudalism. These include increased commercialization, the influx of bullion leading to devalued money and growing expenditure of the ruling classes. With the introduction of new and costly methods of warfare, the feudal lords lost their military significance. The inter-state politics and some major developments in the technology of warfare made it necessary for the states to maintain a standing army and sometimes even a fleet if they wished to survive. These could only be financed and administered by rulers of bigger states who had the capacity to muster greater resources.

During the feudal crisis, the kings face the problem of controlling the outlying regions with limited means at their disposal. In the late 15th century, the growing needs of the government forced the rulers to adopt centralized measures for effective governments over the distant provinces, which had enjoyed a fair degree of autonomy. These provided a multitude of assemblies and bodies, which eroded the King's authority and led to the formation of a decentralized power structure. The economic squeezing by the nobles had led to increase exploitation of serfs and consequently led to peasant rebellions. The weakened nobility look to kings to preserve their privileged

positions and protect them against threats emanating from below. The kings profited from these circumstances and enhanced their own power and wealth at the expense of the nobility. By the end of the 15th century there was widespread support for a strong and effective government to bring internal peace and relief from feudal wars.

The rise of Absolutist states particularly in western Europe implied the absorption of smaller states by stronger and bigger states. This strengthened centralized governments under single sovereign heads, establishing law and order. Thus absolute monarchies carried out territorial expansion and consolidation, administrative centralization and political integration that made them extremely powerful. The absolute monarchies of France, Spain and England acted as sovereign power in their respective states and were not answerable to their subjects for any institutions. Absolutism required domination over the feudal aristocracy and independence from outside challenges including the papacy.

22.3.2 Regional variations of Absolutism

England

One of Europe's oldest and most intricate systems of regal authority was the English monarchy (and remains so to this day). On the island, monarchy first came to power in the 12th century, long before the Age of Absolutism. However, the British monarchy's authority has been constrained ever since the Magna Carta was signed in 1215. Since the Magna Carta, the monarchy on the island has struggled to balance its power with that of the people's civil liberties. For instance, Queen Elizabeth I attracted a lot of admiration for her political, social, and religious tolerance. To keep political power and control, she also used mercantilism, including the colonisation of the New World. James I, her successor, was a little different. James I, like many of the English kings who came after him, was engaged in a never-ending power struggle with Parliament. He openly advocated for absolute monarchy, particularly the notion that he had a divine right to disregard Parliament in order to carry out his agenda. The civil war (1642–1651) that resulted from the infighting between the royal houses and Parliament in the end nearly deprived the English crown of all political power.

Spain

There were numerous absolute rulers in Spain. The Spanish monarchs Philip II, Philip III, and Charles IV, who reigned during the 16th and 17th centuries when Spain was at its height as the most powerful naval empire to emerge from Europe, are some of the best instances of this. Keep in mind that the Spanish monarchs were fervently Catholic and firmly thought that God had granted them the right to reign.To put things in a little more historical perspective, Philip II was the king who attempted to employ the Spanish Armada to attack England during the Reformation in an effort to convert the country to Catholicism. However, using their interpretation of absolute power to not only reign over Spain but also to develop it as a global force, all three of these rulers promoted colonisation not only in Spain but also in the colonies.By taking money and other resources from the Americas and enforcing religious conversion through the use of conquistadors and the Inquisition system, they were able to rule with an iron fist. But ultimately, this wouldn't continue long because their numerous battles (particularly with England) proved expensive and depleted their gold reserves. The Spanish throne was compelled to abdicate by Napoleon's invasion, which took place well into the 19th century.

France

Let us talk about Napoleon now, then France. The French monarchy is remembered as possibly one of the Age of Absolutism's most impactful governments. This is partially attributable to the extreme luxury enjoyed by French kings and queens. They adored expensive parties, opulent palaces, and fine jewellery. In other words, they had luxurious lives while engaging in total debauchery. The French dynasty was started by Henry IV in the 16th century. In large part because of the money the nation amassed as a result of the colonisation of North America, he contributed to establishing France as a major economic and political force. Additionally, French rulers from Henry IV onward were able to finance their opulent tastes and pay for their expanding regime. The most luxurious and enduring of all the absolute kings in French history was perhaps King Louis XIV. He referred himself himself as the "Sun King," and his well-known adage, "L'état, c'est moi!" Also, "I am the state!" In other words, he wanted everyone to be aware of his full control over France. By constructing the Palace of Versailles and maintaining total control over the feudal

nobles, Louis turned France into the European metropolis of luxury. But his extravagant lifestyle also contributed to his people's impoverishment and a horrible economic disaster. Up until King Louis XVI found himself in the thick of a revolution, the following two Louis kings maintained the French opulence. The French monarchy grew less absolute and eventually disappeared under the new French Republic as the French people started to seek civic rights and privileges (based on Enlightenment principles).

Prussia

However, France would not be the only nation affected by the Enlightenment. Beginning in the 17th and 18th centuries, kings in Europe realised that maintaining absolute power was getting harder as their people started demanding their own rights and privileges.The absolute monarchs of Prussia and similar countries were distinct in that they ruled under an innovative version of absolute monarchy known as enlightened absolutism. These monarchs were influenced by Enlightenment values, which resulted in increased support for the arts, a propensity for religious toleration, and a propensity to uphold the law. Frederick the Great can be regarded as the leader of the Enlightenment Absolutists. During his reign as King of Prussia, which spanned the years 1740 to 1786, the Enlightenment movement in philosophy and science was in full swing. By making his subjects' lives better, he thought the Prussian state might be made more contemporary. But more than any previous king, he also promoted religious tolerance. And he was not the only one. Frederick VI of Denmark, Joseph II of Austria, and Catherine the Great were all renowned for incorporating the principles of the Enlightenment into their monarchical rule. However, despite these developments, these tyrants were still kings, and anything they said remained a matter of law. In the end, the absolute monarchs employed Enlightenment principles to strengthen their hold on power and prevent the kinds of uprisings that were happening in France and North America.

22.3.3 Limitations

Absolutism had its own limitations. Absolute rulers raised their standing armies with foreign soldiers constituting the bulk of its force. Diplomacy was institutionalized

through permanent embassies yet matrimonial alliances also prevented. Thus in each region, state building involved imposition on central and provincial elites of a complex of linguistic, ritual, social practices to achieve cultural integration. At another level, there occurred a vertical imposition of elite culture on popular culture and made the entire population of the region under central authority distinct from the people in the adjacent states.

22.4 Conclusion

Thus the 18th century European politics witnessed two different ideologies. Parliamentary monarchy was active in one hand and absolute monarchy or absolutist states were also active on the other hand.

22.5 Model Questions

1. Discuss the main features of 18th century European Politics.
2. How did Parliamentary monarchy emerge?
4. What was the relationship between English crown and Parliament?
5. Trace the growth of absolute monarchy in Spain.
6. How did Enlightened Despotism develop in Prussia?
7. Discuss briefly the regional variations of absolutism.

22.6 Suggested Readings

Perry Anderson. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*, London, 1974

G.R. Elton. *The Tudor Revolution in Government*, London, 1953

Module VI: Political and Economic Issues in the American Revolution

Unit 23 ❑ Understanding the American Revolution– Political & Economic Issues

Structure

23.0 Objectives

23.1 Introduction

23.2 Ideological Background of the Revolution

23.3 Series of Acts

23.4 Tea Act & Boston Tea Party

23.5 The War Begins

23.6 Conclusion

23.7 Model Questions

23.8 Suggested Readings

23.0 Objectives

At the end of this unit the learners will learn about:

- The causes responsible for the American Revolution.
- Critically analyse how far it would correct to explain the revolution as an ideological conflict or a politico economic conflict.

23.1 Introduction

13 of Britain's North American colonies rebelled against its imperial rule, sparking an epic political and military conflict known as the American Revolution that lasted from 1765 to 1783. The British crown and Parliament's imposition of

taxes without the consent of the colonial population sparked the initial revolt. Growing political tensions sparked a never-ending cycle of defiant behaviour and harsh rules that eventually resulted in outright rebellion. The American colonies were able to overthrow the British, win their independence, and create the United States of America with the aid of France. Although many scholars believe that the history of the American Revolution began long before the first shots were fired in 1775, but England and America did not begin an overt parting of the ways until 1763. Through almost a century and a half from the first permanent settlement at Jamestown the colonies grew vastly in economic strength and cultural attainment, and virtually all had long years of self- government behind them.

No single event caused the revolution. Instead, a chain of circumstances resulted in the war. In essence, it started as a conflict between Great Britain's administration of the colonies and how the colonies believed they should be handled. Americans believed they were entitled to all Englishmen's rights. On the other hand, the British believed that the colonies were founded so that they could be exploited in ways that benefited the Crown and Parliament. One of the rallying cries of the American Revolution, "No Taxation without Representation," captures this contradiction.

23.2 Ideological Background of the Revolution

It's crucial to examine the founding fathers' perspectives in order to comprehend what sparked the uprising.

It should be highlighted that the majority of colonists did not share this viewpoint. Despite the absence of pollsters during the American Revolution, it is plausible to assume that public opinion of the cause fluctuated throughout the conflict. Only approximately 40–45% of the free populace, according to historian Robert M. Calhoon, supported the revolution, whereas only about 15–25% of free white males did.

Historically, the 18th century is referred to as the Age of Enlightenment. It was a time when philosophers, statesmen, artists, and other thinkers started to raise fundamental ethical issues about society as a whole, including the politics of government and the function of the church. Many colonists adopted this new style

of thinking throughout the time period, which was also referred to as the Age of Reason.

Several of the leading figures of the revolution had read important works by the Enlightenment thinkers Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and the Baron de Montesquieu. The founders learned novel political ideas from these philosophers, including the separation of powers, the social contract, and limited government.

Particularly Locke's writings made an impression on people. His writings contributed to the discussion of the British government's overreach and the rights of the governed. They gave rise to the "republican" philosophy, which fought against those who were perceived as dictators.

The Puritan and Presbyterian doctrines had an impact on men like Benjamin Franklin and John Adams. These teachings contained such novel, radical notions as the notion that a king has no divine powers and the idea that all men are created equal. Together, these novel ways of thinking caused many people to feel that it was their responsibility to rebel against the rules they believed to be unfair.

Britain failed to establish a comprehensive plan for imperial reform and to specify how the colonies related to the empire. These failures were caused by two things. First, from the War of the Spanish Succession at the turn of the century to the Seven Years' War in 1763, Britain was involved in expensive wars. Politically and financially, perpetual conflict was expensive. Second, different imperial visions split British authorities. Old Whigs and the Tories who supported them dreamed of a totalitarian empire built on conquest and resource extraction. Raising taxes and reducing spending on the colonies were two strategies they used to try to pay off the national debt. Instead of focusing on land and resources, the radical (or Patriot) Whigs' imperial vision was focused on trade and manufacturing. They claimed that increasing the economy would reduce the national debt, not hiking taxes. "Patriot Whigs" claimed that the colonies should have equal status with the mother country rather than a totalitarian empire. Throughout the eighteenth century, the two factions engaged in a bitter debate that impeded cogent reform.

The colonies had their own ideas about where they fit within the empire. As British subjects, they considered themselves to be "entitled to all the natural,

essential, inherent, and inseparable rights of our fellow people in Great-Britain." In the first half of the eighteenth century, the colonies had seen rapid demographic and economic expansion. They thought that part of their success was due to Britain's lack of involvement in the colonies. Because of their success, they have become more vital to the mother country's and the empire's overall economies. By the middle of the century, colonists thought they had a particular place in the empire, which supported Britain's laissez-faire attitude. The colonists are entitled to as many rights, liberties, and privileges as the subjects of England, wrote James Otis Jr. in 1764.

The colonies created their own regional political structures during this time. The colonies were each referred to by Samuel Adams in the Boston Gazette as a "separate body politic" from Britain. They established a colonial legislature almost quickly after each colony was established. These bodies carried out much of the same responsibilities as the British Commons, such as collecting taxes from citizens, controlling how colonial revenues were spent, and paying salaries to royal officials. Elite colonial leaders unsuccessfully lobbied the Ministry to acknowledge the legal standing of their assemblies in the early 1700s, but the Ministry was too preoccupied with European wars. Royal governors appointed by the Board of Trade made attempts to curtail the authority of the assembly throughout the first part of the eighteenth century, but they mainly failed. The power of the assemblies only grew. Many colonists began to believe that the assemblies had the same authority over them as Parliament did in England. They saw the British government's inactivity as supporting their longstanding local government practises. However, the British Ministry and Parliament considered the matter as postponed until the Ministry made the decision to directly address the appropriate role of the assemblies. A revolution was not inevitable, but conflict was on the cards.

Colonial political culture evolved differently in the colonies than it did in the mother country. Land was necessary for political participation in both Britain and the colonies, but as land was easier to come by in the colonies, more colonists took part in politics. The "country" party in Britain served as an influence for colonial political culture. These concepts, which are collectively referred to as the republican ideology, emphasised the corrupting effects of power on individuals, the need for self-government participants to be moral (i.e., putting the "public good" above their own

self-interest), and the necessity of being constantly on guard against the emergence of conspiracies, centralised control, and tyranny. These beliefs were only held by a tiny minority in Britain, but they were commonly held throughout the colonies.

The Enlightenment and the Great Awakening, two seemingly opposing schools of thought, started to coalesce in the colonies in the 1740s, challenging traditional notions of authority. John Locke may have had the biggest influence on colonial thought of any individual philosopher. In his Essay *Concerning Human Understanding*, John Locke believed that people were essentially shaped by their environments and that the mind was initially a *tabula rasa* (or blank slate). The aristocracy at that time was prosperous or successful not because they were naturally superior but because they had more access to riches, education, and patronage. The essay *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* that Locke wrote after this one provided radical new concepts regarding the value of education. As opposed to subtly accepting tradition, education would create logical individuals capable of thinking for themselves and challenging authority. Over time, these concepts started to have a significant impact on the colonies.

The colonies also went through an extraordinary wave of evangelical Protestant revivalism at the same time that Locke's theories on knowledge and education gained traction in North America. The mysterious, itinerant preacher Rev. George Whitefield traversed the colonies in 1739–1741, delivering Calvinist sermons to throngs of people. His lectures were intended to appeal to his listeners' emotions rather than Locke's logic. Whitefield taught his audience that the only way to find salvation was to take charge of one's own direct relationship with God, a process that became known as a "conversion" experience. Additionally, he contended that the "unconverted" clergy who make up the current Church hierarchies merely serve as a barrier between people and God. In his aftermath, other congregations broke apart and new itinerant preachers adopted his teachings. Both Locke and Whitefield had the impact of encouraging people to challenge authority and take control of their own lives.

The process of eighteenth-century colonists becoming more culturally akin to Britons is known as "Anglicization," notwithstanding their political and intellectual distinctions. As the economies of the colonies developed, they quickly took on importance as a market for British manufacturing exports. Colonists with access to

British markets and discretionary cash tried to imitate British culture. By the middle of the eighteenth century, middle-class colonists could also purchase things like British clothing, dining utensils, and other hitherto regarded luxuries. The desire to take advantage of British liberty and the desire to buy British products were intertwined.

The colonies and the mother country developed fundamentally different political, intellectual, cultural, and economic systems. When Britain finally started enacting an imperial reform programme following the Seven Years' War, it clashed with colonists' perceptions of the empire and their place within it, resulting in latent tensions that would eventually come to the fore.

23.3 Series of Acts

After three decades of Whig dominance, King George III assumed the throne in 1760 and appointed Tories to his Ministry. They stood for a totalitarian view of empire in which colonies would be subject. The first post-war imperial step by Britain was the Royal Proclamation of 1763. In an effort to prevent expensive wars with Native Americans, the King restricted settlement west of the Appalachian Mountains. However, colonists objected and clamoured for entry to the region for which they had fought alongside the British.

Parliament enacted two additional measures in 1764. The Sugar Act reduced the levy in half while stepping up enforcement in an effort to fight the extensive molasses smuggling in New England. Smugglers would also face trials in vice-admiralty tribunals rather than by juries. The Currency Act, which prohibited colonies from issuing paper money, was also passed by Parliament. In the colonies, hard currency like gold and silver coins was in short supply. The absence of money hindered the transatlantic economies of the colonies as they became more advanced, but in 1764 it was especially harmful as the postwar recession had already started. Some colonists started to see a pattern of taxing and limitation after the Currency Act, the Proclamation of 1763, and the Sugar Act's cancellation of jury trials for smugglers.

Parliament enacted the Stamp Act in March 1765. The Stamp Act established a new direct (or internal) tax, whereas the Sugar Act sought to compel merchants to pay an already-existing levy. The colonists had never before been directly taxed by Parliament. Instead, colonies made a financial contribution to the empire by paying indirect internal taxes like customs duties. "A right to levy an internal tax on the colonies, without their assent for the sole purpose of income, is denied, a right to regulate their trade without their consent is, granted," wrote Daniel Dulany of Maryland in 1765.

All printed materials, such as newspapers, pamphlets, diplomas, legal documents, and even playing cards, were to be required to bear stamps. The Stamp Act had a much wider range of direct effects than the Sugar Act, which mainly affected merchants, including printers, attorneys, college graduates, and even sailors who played cards. In part, this resulted in larger, more widespread resistance.

Three types of resistance emerged, mostly based on class: elites engaged in legislative resistance, merchants engaged in economic resistance, and common colonists engaged in popular protest. The ruling class of the colonial era initially reacted with legislative resistance by passing resolutions in their assemblies. The "Virginia Resolves," which said that colonists were entitled to "all the liberties, privileges, franchises, and immunities... enjoyed by the people of Great Britain," are the most well-known anti-Stamp Act resolutions. However, when the resolutions were printed throughout the colonies, they frequently included three additional, much more radical resolutions that had not been approved by the Virginia House of Burgesses. The last of these stated that anyone who disagreed "shall be deemed an enemy to this his majesty's colony" and that only "the general assembly of this colony have any right or power to impose or lay any taxation." In the end, the Stamp Act Congress was called in New York City in October 1765 as a result of the radicalization of subsequent replies from other colonial assemblies due to the propagation of these additional resolves throughout the colonies. Benjamin Franklin, John Dickinson, Thomas Hutchinson, Philip Livingston, and James Otis were among the delegates from the nine colonies.

Similar to the Virginia Resolves, the Stamp Act Congress published a "Declaration of Rights and Grievances" that reaffirmed colonists' equality with native Britons

while simultaneously pledging devotion to the King and "all proper obedience" to Parliament. These rights included the ability to have a jury trial, which had been restricted by the Sugar Act, and the right to only have their elected officials impose taxes on them. "It is a vital tenet of the English system, that the subject shall not be taxed without his agreement," wrote Daniel Dulany in 1765. It was referred to by Benjamin Franklin as the "fundamental Maxim of any free Government." The colonies claimed they were not represented in Parliament and could not be taxed by that body because they did not elect representatives. In response, Parliament and the Ministry claimed that the colonists were "virtually represented," just like the citizens of the English boroughs and counties where MPs were not chosen by the people. The colonists, on the other hand, were opposed to the idea of virtual representation; one pamphleteer even called it a "monstrous idea."

Economic opposition to the Stamp Act was the second type of protest. Merchants in significant port towns prepared non-importation agreements during the Stamp Act Congress' deliberations in the hopes that their refusal to import British products would persuade British merchants to advocate for the repeal of the Stamp Act. The strategy worked. Merchants did exert pressure on Parliament to repeal as British shipments to the colony significantly decreased.

Public protest was the third sort of opposition, and possibly the most significant. As a result of the violent riots that broke out in Boston, Peter Oliver, the designated Massachusetts stamp collector, was burned in effigy and his building was dragged "down to the Ground in five minutes." The following day, Oliver gave notice of his resignation as stamp collector. A few days later, a group of people descended on the residence of his brother-in-law, Lt. Governor Thomas Hutchinson, who had made an outspoken case for accepting the stamp duty. The majority of Hutchinson's house and possessions were burned before the night was out.

Direct taxes had been opposed by the colonies, but the Declaratory Act gave Parliament the authority to impose them. Additionally, the colonists expressly acknowledged Parliament's authority to control colonial trade in their letters to Parliament and countless pamphlets. The Townshend Acts, which were approved in June 1767 and introduced additional customs levies on common goods like lead, glass, paint, and tea in place of direct taxes, represented Britain's next attempt to

raise money from the colonies. Along with formal enforcement methods, the Acts also increased the number of vice-admiralty tribunals and established a new American Board of Customs Commissioners to prosecute smugglers. Customs officers and other royal officials, such as the governors, would be paid with proceeds from customs seizures, motivating them to find guilty defendants. Since paying the governor's salary gave the assemblies great control over them, these actions boosted the British government's presence in the colonies while limiting the authority of the colonial assemblies. Naturally, colonists once more resisted.

23.4 Tea Act & Boston Tea Party

To help the struggling East India Company, which had fallen behind in its annual payments to Britain, Parliament introduced the Tea Act in 1773. In addition to being drowning in debt, the Company also had about 15 million pounds of tea stockpiled in warehouses from India to England. The Regulating Act, which was passed by the Parliament in 1773 effectively placed the struggling corporation under government administration. The Tea Act was subsequently approved, enabling the Company to sell tea directly to colonists without paying the customary import tariffs. The cost of tea for colonists would be significantly reduced as a result, but once more, they refused.

Since the East India Company's monopoly made it difficult for merchants to compete, they resisted. But it only had a small, limited impact on a small set of people, much like the Sugar Act. The Tea Act's overwhelming opposition was motivated more by moral reasons. Even though the tea was less expensive, colonists would be paying the charge and therefore tacitly accepting Parliament's right to tax them by purchasing it. Prime Minister Lord North was a "great schemer," according to the Massachusetts Gazette, who tried "to deceive us and to effectively establish that Act, which will forever after he argued as a precedent for any imposition the Parliament of Great-Britain shall consider appropriate to saddle us with."

The Tea Act required payment of the duty at the time the ship unloaded. The major port cities debated what to do when the ships arrived as reflected in newspaper writings and letters throughout the summer of 1773. In November, the Boston Sons

of Liberty, led by Samuel Adams and John Hancock, decided to take "the danger of their lives and property" in order to "prevent the landing and sale of the [tea], and the payment of any duty thereon." Men were chosen at the conference to watch over the wharfs and ensure that the tea remained in the ships until they arrived back in London. The tea was prevented from reaching the coast thanks to this, but by December 16 the ships were still there.

Patriots were inspired to do the same to the tea that was waiting in their harbours as word of the action spread throughout the colonies. In addition to Charleston, Philadelphia, and New York, countless more smaller "tea parties" that occurred during 1774 also resulted in the destruction of tea.

Britain responded right away. The British referred to a group of four laws introduced by Parliament the following spring as the "Coercive Acts." The "Intolerable Acts," however, were how the colonists referred to them. The Boston Port Act first closed the harbour and stopped all trade entering and leaving the city. By dissolving the legislature and limiting town meetings, the Massachusetts Government Act completely underwent British rule. Any royal officer suspected of a crime might be tried in Britain rather than by Massachusetts courts and juries thanks to the Administration of Justice Act. The British army was finally permitted to house freshly arrived soldiers in colonists' homes once the Quartering Act was established for all colonies. The King, his Ministry, and Parliament swiftly put an end to the revolt after determining that Boston was in open rebellion.

The other colonies helped Massachusetts out. The colonists gathered food in order to send it to Boston. In order to show their support, Virginia's House of Burgesses requested a day of fasting and prayer. Patriots established the "Provincial Congress" in Massachusetts, and they took over the county and local governments as well as the courts throughout 1774. A body made up of middle-class colonists, the Mechanics' Committee, was chosen by the people of New York to guide the colonies' response to the Coercive Acts. All of the colonies, with the exception of Georgia, had Committees of Correspondence and/or extra-legal assemblies in place by early 1774. They adopted Massachusetts' strategy throughout the year and took control of the royal governments.

23.5 The War Begins

More than a year before Congress proclaimed independence, the conflict broke out in Lexington and Concord. In 1775, the British thought that the colonial uprising could be put down with just the threat of war and a few light incursions to grab supplies. However, those insignificant invasions escalated into a full-fledged armed confrontation. Despite an early American triumph in Boston, the challenge of confronting the largest military in the world remained.

In the summer of 1776, the forces that had been in Boston came in New York. Soon after, the greatest expeditionary force in British history—which included tens of thousands of "Hessians"—was assembled. Expeditions to seize control of the Hudson River and cut off New England from the rest of the continent could easily be launched from New York. Additionally, there were a lot of loyalists in New York, especially in the Anglican and commercial groups. The British finally attacked Brooklyn and Manhattan in October. After suffering significant losses, the Continental Army fled via New Jersey. Commander-in-chief George Washington played a significant role in the war. He needed something to boost morale and promote reenlistment as winter arrived. He therefore transported the few thousand troops he had left across the Delaware River at night, and on Christmas Day, he launched a successful surprise attack on the Hessian camp at Trenton. Following the catastrophe in New York, the victory provided the Continental Army with much-needed supplies and a morale boost.

23.6 Conclusion

As a result, the intellectual foundation of the American Revolution was anchored in the current politico-economic environment. Between 1765 and 1770, the nature of colonial resistance had changed. During the Stamp Act opposition, elites conducted congresses and produced resolutions while violent crowds tore down homes and burned effigies, with little coordination between colonies. However, strategies for opposition to the Townshend Acts grew more comprehensive and organised. Colonists who had previously been barred from meaningful political engagement began to

collect signatures, and all classes of colonists took part in the resistance by refusing to purchase British goods. The colonial population became more vigilant and resistant as a result of Britain's failed attempts at imperial reform in the 1760s, but more importantly, the colonial and continental political spheres were greatly expanded, far beyond anything that could have been predicted just a few years earlier. The colonists' united political identity in America started to take shape as a result of a new feeling of grievances.

23.7 Model Questions

1. Discuss briefly the ideological background of the American revolution.
2. How did the various oppressive acts created the background of the American revolution?
3. Write a short note on Boston Tea Party.
4. What role did George Washington play in the war against the British?

23.8 Suggested Readings

Perks, H.B. *The United States of America: A History*, New York, 2019.

Beard, Charles and Mary. *Rise of American Civilization*, New York, 1993.

Module VII: Preludes to the Industrial Revolution

Unit 24 ❑ Causal Origin of Industrial Revolution

Structure

24.0 Objectives
24.1 Introduction
24.2 Industrial Revolution–Historical Definitions
24.3 Background Revolutions of Industrial Revolution
24.3.1 Agricultural Revolution
24.3.2 Demographic Revolution
24.3.3 Transport Revolution
24.3.4 Technological Revolution
24.4 Elements of production
24.5 Political Stability
24.6 Conclusion
24.7 Model Question
24.8 Suggested Readings

24.0 Objectives

The unit will enquire on the origin of the Industrial Revolution. What were the possible causes responsible behind the coming of the Industrial age is the main focus of this unit.

24.1 Introduction

The Industrial Revolution saw the shift from small, hand-operated cottage industries to new, mass-produced commodities built in factories powered by steam

and water. Many of the technological advancements that contributed to the Industrial Revolution were developed in Britain, where it all started around the year 1760. In terms of employment, output value, and capital invested, the textile sector dominated the Industrial Revolution. The adoption of contemporary production techniques was also pioneered by the textile sector. The Industrial Revolution was a significant turning point in history that had some sort of impact on practically every element of daily life. It started in Great Britain for a number of significant reasons.

24.2 Industrial Revolution–Historical Definitions

Arnold Toynbee was one of the first economists to adequately analyse the British experience of industrialization in terms of specific concepts. In 1881, Toynbee gave a series of lectures on the topic at the University of Oxford. His students later published these lectures in 1884, following his passing. Toynbee chose 1760 as his place of departure. He referred to the tremendous process of industrialization that started to turn England into a modern civilization in 1760 as the "Industrial Revolution." He claimed that the steam engine and the power loom struck with such force that the old order was abruptly destroyed. Innovations created a new world while destroying the old one. Economic changes and lawlessness marked the time. It is believed that Toynbee's lecture's publishing led to the term "Industrial Revolution" becoming widely used in academia. Toynbee did not, however, coin the phrase "IR." It was first used as a phrase by a French economist in 1837. He asserted that the industrial state in England had undergone the greatest transformation throughout the revolution. Engles first used the word IR in his book Condition of the Working Class in England from 1845, long before social lives began. He claimed that the IR was just as significant for England as the political revolutions in France and Germany and the intellectual revolution in England. In 1848, John Stuart Mill used the phrase in his *Principles of Economy*. An English barrister named Michael Angela Garry described how the telegraph and steam transportation had a silent revolution on humankind in 1852. IR was a concept introduced by Karl Marx in the first book of Dos Capital in 1867. He commended the use of the term "inter-period transformation" (IR) as a descriptive designation of the process of transformation between two periods of capitalist development, namely the period of proper manufacture based on

the division of manual labour and the period of modern industry based on machinery. He saw the 1785 invention of John Watt's steaming apparatus as the start of the Industrial Revolution. It was the first invention to fundamentally alter the nature of manufacturing and the working conditions of English labourers.

According to Carlo M. Cipolla, the IR is a vast revolution with no analogues in human history. The course of history was inevitably disrupted as a result. It caused a significant break in the progression of historical events. Cipolla asserts that a civilization built on trade, manufacture, and professions motivated by the notions of expediency, profit, and to some extent reason began to form in the region where the predominate agrarian feudal order had been. Man becomes a manipulator of machines powered by inanimate sources of energy after being transformed by the Industrial Revolution from a farmer and shepherd.

According to Phillis Deane, not every nation that experiences an Industrial Revolution will experience it in the same way. However, it requires some discernible adjustments to the features and processes of economic organisation. There are seven related modifications in all. (1) widespread and systematic application of empirical knowledge and modern science to the production process; (2) specialisation of economic activity focused on production for both domestic and foreign markets; and (3) migration of people from rural to urban areas; (4) the expansion and depersonalization of the typical unit of production, which is based more on the family or the tribe than on the corporate or public enterprise; (5) the shifting of labour from primary production to manufactured goods and services; (6) the extensive and intensive use of capital resources as a replacement for and supplement to human effort; and (7) the emergence of new social and occupational classes based on ownership.

The English Industrial Revolution's development mechanism was highlighted by W. W. Rostow in his 1960 book *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non Communist Manifesto*. He has updated the German historical school's fundamental notion of the stages of economic progress. He identified five stages of development: (1) traditional society; (2) preconditions for takeoff; (3) takeoff; (4) drive to maturity; and (5) high mass consumption age. Traditional societies were founded on pre-Newtonian science,

technology, and perspectives on the physical world. The society's economy was bland, flat, and largely stationary.

The possibilities offered by contemporary science and technology either weren't present or weren't routinely and systematically used. Agriculture received a very high percentage of resources, and the social structure was hierarchical with little room for vertical movement. Those who owned or controlled the land typically held the lion's share of political power. However, the prerequisites for takeoff were met in 18th-century Britain. Rostow asserts that current science's ideas, which are being converted into new products, have applications in both industry and agriculture. Britain went through these phases as a result of its advantageous geographic location, resource endowment, comparatively enlightened social and political system, as well as the expansion of her markets and trade. New breeds of business-minded men emerged, ready to risk their savings and pursue profits or modernization. By this period, banks and other organisations for raising funds had emerged. Investment in business and industry rose as a result. It made the environment favourable for the IR to emerge. It was a significant turning point. Economic growth became unstoppable and automatic as a result. It signalled the beginning of steady economic expansion. Rostow compares the IR to an aeroplane or missile that unexpectedly takes off from its runway or launching pad and continues to fly. According to Rostow, the establishment of a dominant economic sector that experiences rapid growth is the sign of a takeoff. The cotton industry was Britain's primary takeoff industry. The national economy was significantly impacted, and spillover effects were felt in linked industries. S. Pollard, D.W. Crossky, and R. M. Hertwell have backed up Rostow's account of the Industrial Revolution. According to Pollard and Crossky, the preparation to the takeoff into persistent growth happened after 1760.

24.3 Background Revolutions of Industrial Revolution

The Industrial Revolution was preceded by a number of structural changes in various fields. Among those changes four revolutions were the most important. These are–(1) Agricultural Revolution, (2) Demographic Revolution, (3) Transport Revolution and (4) Technological Revolution.

24.3.1 Agricultural Revolution

For generations, England has been an agricultural country. Crop rotation methods had advanced throughout that time, allowing soil to remain more fertile and increasing growth yields. Additionally, farmers experimented with cattle breeding by limiting breeding to their largest animals. Larger, healthier cattle and lamb were produced as a result.

Wealthy landowners acquired lesser farms in the 1700s and fenced in their larger parcels. Enclosure, or the process of fencing in huge areas of land, was one of the most significant changes brought about by the agrarian revolution. The majority of the land was cultivated in the Middle Ages by solitary farmers, each of whom got a strip of a broad, open field. Changes in land usage were difficult to accomplish because the land was utilised "in common," and changes in farming practice were also slow in implementation.

An astounding number of more than 3500 distinct acts of Parliament sanctioning the enclosure of agricultural land were passed between 1730 and 1820. As a result, the Midlands and the north were essentially enclosed.

Although this enclosure frequently made life difficult for peasant farmers, the landlords were able to introduce innovative farming techniques like controlled crop rotation, regulated stock breeding, and more productive farming on marginal farmland.

These developments had a significant social cost because they drove the relocation of the rural working classes frequently in search of employment in industrial urban regions, made many poor farm labourers unemployed, caused impoverished farmers to lose their land.

The Agrarian Revolution brought about several improvements, including the planting of crops (especially clover and turnips) to supply sustenance for animals that overwintered. New farm equipment, like the wheeled seed drill, which automated the customary method of manually dispersing seeds, was equally significant.

The horse hoe, a tool for removing weeds from between crop rows, was another innovation. Early wooden implements were replaced by iron ones. The iron plough was a significant improvement over the wooden one and was so much more effective that horses could pull it instead of oxen. Affluent "Gentlemen Farmers" like Viscount

Townshend and Coke of Holkham Hall (Norfolk) popularised agricultural experimentation. Scientific research centres were established and regular county-by-county agricultural reports were prepared under the reign of George III, who was fervently committed to agricultural reform. During the Napoleonic Wars, when Britain had to survive without supplies from Europe, the pace of reform quickened. As a result, huge tracts of land were initially farmed. As a result, yields increased, making it easier for Britain to feed its expanding population.

Although the enclosure movement increased crop yields and farming productivity, it also uprooted many small farmers. These people frequently relocated to urban areas to work in the factories.

24.3.2 Demographic Revolution

The demographic revolution was one of the important preconditions of the Industrial Revolution in England. The population of England grew rapidly during this period. It reached from around 5 million people in 1700 to nearly 9 million by 1801. This population hike was closely connected with rapid urban growth also. In order to seek out new job opportunities in nearby towns and cities, many people left the countryside. Others arrived from far away places from rural areas of Ireland, Scotland and Wales as well as other parts of Europe.

Most of the 18th-century towns possessed remarkably young populations. Young people from different areas were drawn to urban areas by the lure of regular and full-time employment. Another important cause was the entertainment that was on offer there: the theaters, inns and pleasure gardens, for example, and the shops displaying the latest fashions, had largely attracted the rich young people.

London, the capital city of the UK, in particular was flooded with a lot of young people every year. Among these newly arrived young men, many worked as apprentices to the capital's numerous tradesmen. Other new settlers gained employment as domestic servants to the numerous aristocratic families who resided in elegantly built town houses.

Surprisingly the death rates remained relatively high throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. In spite of that, by the end of the 18th century London's population had reached nearly one million people, fed by a ceaseless flow of newcomers. By

1800 almost one in ten of the entire British population lived in the capital city. Elsewhere, thousands of people moved to the rapidly growing industrial cities of northern England, such as Manchester and Leeds, in order to work in the new factories and textile mills that sprang up there from the 1750s onwards.

24.3.3 Transport Revolution

The growth of the Industrial Revolution largely depended on the ability to transport raw materials and goods over long distances. Thus transportation played a huge role in fact the most important role in the Industrial Revolution. It was a simultaneous process. Changes in transportation started just before the IR. During the Industrial Revolution, transportation improved rapidly with the advancement and invention of roads, canals, steamboats, and railroads.

The road network of Great Britain was not in a very good condition prior to the Industrial Revolution. It grew fast as a huge pressure came from the changing industrial growth. Thus the road network of England began to innovate in the form of Turnpike Trusts. Tolls were charged to travel on especially improved roads, and this helped meet the demand at the beginning of the revolution. However, many deficiencies remained and new modes of transport were invented as a result.

Rivers remained an important way used for transport for centuries, but they had many problems also. In the early modern period there were sincere attempts to improve rivers, including cutting past long meanders. This created a vast canal network, which was essentially man-made waterways. Heavy goods could now be moved more easily and cheaply. Although initially slow boom that began in the Midlands and Northwest opened up new markets for a growing industry.

24.3.4 Technological Revolution

The Post scientific Revolution era witnessed a rapid growth in technology. A number of new scientific inventions and developed technologies played a vital role in the Industrial Revolution as the term industrial revolution denoted machine run factory-based production system. In short it may be said that the new innovations changed the way things were powered, how goods were manufactured, how people communicated, and the way goods were transported. These new four-fold developments

paved the way of industrial revolution to grow rapidly and spread throughout Europe and elsewhere.

Steam power and electricity played a major role in the Industrial growth. James Watt invented a new type of steam engine in 1781 that could be used to power machines in factories. In the 1800s steam engines grew in size and also became more powerful. They were used to not only power factories, but also for purpose of transportation by steamboats and trains.

The textile industry was the first grown industry during the Industrial Revolution. Many inventions related to this industry took place during the 18th century. One of the first major inventions among these was the "spinning jenny". It was invented by James Hargreaves in England in 1764. Samuel Crompton made improvements in the textile industry with the "spinning mule", in 1779.

24.4 Elements of production

Another important reason why the Industrial Revolution began in Great Britain was the abundance of what economists refer to as the three elements of production. These production variables include land, labour, and capital. These are the inputs utilised in the manufacturing of goods or services to generate a profit.

In this economic sense, land is more than just useful open terrain for industry to build on. It also refers to the natural resources required for industrialization. Coal was required in large amounts to fuel steam engines and furnaces throughout the Industrial Revolution. Iron ore was required for machines, structures, and bridges. Both were abundant in England, as were rivers for inland transportation.

For the industries, labour constitutes a sizable workforce. With a growing population as a result of increased food production and the enclosure movement driving people to cities, England's industries had more than enough workers. Finally, capital refers to the funds required to fund industry. The well-developed banking system in the United Kingdom enabled loans to be made to industries in order to assist them succeed.

24.5 Political Stability

Finally, the Industrial Revolution thrived in the Great Britain for political reasons. While England was frequently at war, all of these conflicts occurred outside the kingdom. As a result, the country's existence was rather tranquil. The Glorious Revolution in 1688 was the last significant political upheaval, and a period of calm and stability followed while other nations had revolutions or political transformations.

Furthermore, England's governmental structure fostered trade and entrepreneurship. A simple legal structure allowed for the founding of joint-stock firms, the enforcement of property rights, and the respecting of patents for inventions.

Finally, in 1832, Parliament approved the Great Reform Act. This gave seats in Parliament to huge cities that sprang up during the Industrial Revolution while taking seats away from smaller towns ruled by a wealthy patron. The Act also increased the electorate from approximately 400,000 to 650,000, making almost one out of every five adult males eligible to vote.

24.6 Conclusion

Thus the industrial revolution was an effect of several causes. All these exogenous and endogenous factors collectively created a favourable condition for the coming of the industrial revolution.

24.7 Model Questions

1. Why did Industrial revolution first take place in England?
2. Elucidate the historical definitions of the Industrial revolution.
3. How did the Industrial revolution benefit from the Agricultural revolution?
4. Do you think the Transport revolution was a pre-condition of the Industrial revolution?
5. What technological advancements were made before the Industrial revolution?

24.8 Suggested Readings

Deane, Phillis. *The First Industrial Revolution*, London, 1998.

Rostow, W. W. *Stages of Economic Growth: A Non Communist Manifesto*, New York, 1960.

Landes, David S. *The Unbound Prometheus: Technological Change and Industrial Development in Western Europe from 1750 to the Present*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Allen, Robert C. *The British Industrial Revolution in Global Perspective*, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Mokyr, Joel. *The Enlightened Economy- An Economic History of Britain 1700-1850*, Yale University Press, 2009.