

SWMUN 2020 Jacobite Rebellion Study Guide

Table of Contents

SWMUN 2020 Clash of Dynasties Study Guide	1
Table of Contents	2
Welcome to Crisis	4
Letter from the Directors	4
What is Crisis?	5
What is Crisis	5
Who is in a Crisis?	5
The Crisis Staff	5
The Delegates	6
Chairs	6
The Rest of the World	7
Time	7
Communication	7
Within each cabinet	7
To the Crisis Staff	7
From the Rest of the World	7
Role of the King within the Governance of Britain	8
History of the House of Stuart	9
Foreign Relations and Economic Situation in Britain	10
Internal relations and Politics for Britain	11
Military Capabilities and History	12

Welcome to Crisis

Letter from the Directors

Honourable Delegates,

It is our greatest pleasure to welcome you to an incredibly unique crisis, unlike most that you will have come across before. Set in the heart of England in the middle of the 1600s, you will be tasked with a historical event unknown to many, but with a vast array of knowledge to be discovered. Spies, espionage, war and betrayal, you will be tested to your limits to know who you can and cannot trust. The sides are blurrier than ever before, and your positions less secure. Survival is the key, not just of yourself, but your beliefs and leaders.

Betrayed by his daughter, ripped from his throne and facing loss beyond imagining, James II is in a desperate position. Left with only Ireland as a basis, which has grown increasingly lawless with Protestant militias being disbanded, James plans his revolt to retake what was his.

With Parliament having ordered an Irish expeditionary force in March, James has arrived in Ireland itself, ready to begin. Earlier today, Viscount Dundee has launched a Scottish rebellion.

William will struggle to retain his throne, as James will struggle to retake it. Espionage, military, politics and social change will intermingle in this complex period.

The fate of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland hang in the balance, how will you shape them?

Remember to be detailed, be thorough, and most importantly, enjoy yourself. Good luck and have fun.

Best Wishes

Zoe Braddick and Jack Palmer Cross

SWMUN 2020 Jacobite Rebellion Crisis Directors

What is Crisis?

What is Crisis

A crisis is a simulation of the world, with a focus on a specific issue or area of the world.

There are different types of crisis as listed below. This crisis is a Joint Cabinet Crisis.

1. United Nations (normally Security Council) Crises: Delegates represent a country as in normal MUN.
2. Single Cabinet Crises: Delegates represent individual people and interests smaller than a country with everyone in one room, in one committee.
3. Joint Cabinet Crisis (JCC): Delegates represent individual people and interests smaller than a country with everyone in multiple rooms, in multiple committees. Typically, there will be two cabinets with each cabinet being some aspect of a government and individuals are ministers or the like within the cabinet. This is the style of crisis that we will be following
4. Alternative Crisis: Delegates represent people in a committee or cabinet of some sort.

Aims of each delegate in a Joint Cabinet Crisis:

1. Faithfully act as your character would
2. Advance your factional, familial or ministerial interests
3. Advance your personal interests – subtly distinct from points 1 and 2
4. Have fun

Who is in a Crisis?

The Crisis Staff

The Crisis Staff are the people who run the conference. They have a number of roles of which the principal role is arbitrating 'truth'. They decide what has and hasn't happened, that have occurred and then keep the charge of what occurs. If the Crisis Staff do not know an event has occurred and if the Crisis Staff do not agree that it has happened, then in broad terms it hasn't.

The Crisis staff oversee choosing the crisis and assigning character biographies. They also begin the crisis through initial events and maintain it by adding new twists. They should be committed to overseeing not only well organised, logical crises but also one that is fun and interesting for all participants.

The Delegates

You are a character; you have a position and responsibility for your ministry and your faction.

As such you have authority to wield, though some of your decisions are however subject to being overruled by the head of your cabinet, a cabinet majority, or a similar figure if that is how your cabinet operates. The Crisis Staff are also able to decline or misinterpret any request they see fit. They won't however, in general, do anything bad to you but misinterpreting orders are a common feature, so try to be as specific as possible in your instructions. Therefore, delegates are encouraged to use the powers given to them.

This is done mainly in 3 ways:

1. Writing a note to the Crisis Staff requesting actions to be undertaken. For example: "Bishop Anselm would like to enlist 5 knights from his personal household to act as his personal bodyguards. One of these knights is to be dressed in peasant clothing and keep a watchful eye in crowds close to him to find people preparing malevolent acts". The more detail that is given the more chance it will be successful
2. Passing a document as a cabinet. This can be written in any format you choose. This too must be sent to the Crisis Staff.
3. Diplomacy. Deciding between delegates' actions or policies that have there is a gentleman's agreement that actions will be done, again the Crisis Staff has been informed and all parties have signed it.

These will be sent online via the Google Form Provided.

Chairs

The chair of the committee holds the following responsibilities:

1. To help the cabinet work well, enabling everyone to speak and be heard and in general make sure everyone feels involved in the crisis. To this end, they will decide the rules and formality of debate within their cabinet and typically chair as well as participate in the debate.
2. To communicate with the Crisis Staff what is happening to enable the Crisis Staff to know what is going on and stay ahead of the game- they are part of the Crisis Staff's eyes
3. To pass on messages regarding logistical announcements of the conference
4. To help the Crisis Staff choose delegate awards and as such are ineligible to win themselves
5. To keep track of the agenda and remember things that need to be addressed. Since a lot happens during the Crisis it is easy to forget something. It is up to everyone to remember but ultimately the chair will often end up having to turn the debate to important topics. If something is forgotten, then the consequences can be disastrous; the loss of a strategic advantage or even a war and several members of the cabinet dead. (In which case, a delegate whose character has been removed

from the cabinet is reassigned with a new character, complete with a character profile, portfolio and bio.)

The Rest of the World

Anyone, be they a person, national organisation, a foreign state or international body who is not represented by a delegate is instead run by the crisis staff. The Crisis Staff then have them act as they see fit, within realistic boundaries.

Time

Crises operate in faux real-time whereby time in the simulation moves forward as time, in reality, does but does not necessarily mean one second = one second. Time will progress depending on how well the cabinet deals with the crisis. The whole crisis is likely to take place over the course of less than a year. Sometimes a crisis will jump forward in time, you should be informed of this when it occurs by crisis staff and typically takes place over breaks.

Normally everything that happened in reality in the past has happened in the simulation in the past.

Communication

Communication is key and in the crisis occurs in various ways:

Within each cabinet

Just talk to each other, whether through formal debate or otherwise. Crisis tends to be more relaxed than other MUN committees, at least in terms of rules of procedure.
From the Crisis Staff

The Crisis staff will communicate by visiting in person, through notes to individuals and information to all of the cabinets, these can be through both electronic and physical means.

To the Crisis Staff

Similarly, send notes or electronic communication.

From the Rest of the World

Media reports and your intelligence will tell you many things about the state of the world. Also, a whole cabinet you can invite a specific person to come in and ask questions about events. For example, you could invite an expert on a subject, a representative of a

different cabinet or anything you can think of. It is at the crisis staffs on whether they grant these requests and what form they take.

Role of the King within the Governance of England

The Role of the King in Governing England, Scotland and Ireland

The Idea of the Three Kingdoms

In 1689, The British Isles consisted of three separate kingdoms which were claimed to be ruled by the same king, whether it be King William III and Queen Mary II or King James II. These Kingdoms were England, Scotland and Ireland. Each Kingdom was seen as a politically distinct Kingdom and often was not beholden to the laws of the other Kingdom. Each Kingdom saw taxation raised at different times, for different things, and laws introduced outside of the introduction of the same or similar laws in the other Kingdoms. Whilst Ireland would see itself more intertwined with the affairs of England, following it into every war England had seen from 1542 up until 1800 (when Ireland was integrated into the United Kingdom), Scotland would see far more autonomy, often staying neutral in many wars fought by England and Ireland, for example the 1624 to 1628 where England and Ireland saw direct involvement in the Thirty Years War, whereas the Kingdom of Scotland independently declared war on Spain in 1625 and France in 1627 making peace with both in 1630.

The Three Kingdoms were tied, had the same monarch and held similar interests, but were legally independent.

Legislation in the Three Kingdoms and the War of the Three Kingdoms

Each of the Three Kingdoms had a long existing parliamentary institution. England and Ireland both possessed a bicameral parliament consisting of a House of Lords and a House of Commons, whilst Scotland held a unicameral parliament following a similar model to the French États généraux. This generally resulted in the King holding significantly more power in Scotland than he did in England. However, none of these parliaments were not permanent institutions and were often dissolved and recalled as a King wished. Once the King dissolved the parliament he would rule by decree without the interference of Parliament. The Parliament could not force its will upon the King and acted as little more than a temporary advisory council.

If the King could dissolve legislative bodies the question arises, why would the King not just dissolve the Parliament and rule by decree? The answer as it is so often when it comes to government and politics; taxation. As a result of the First Barons' War, King John of England, was forced to authorise the granting of Magna Carta (The Great Charter) in 1215, this introduced many freedoms and liberties of the nobility, the gentry and the burghers (High-status men of large towns and cities), the most substantial of which was clause 14, which introduced the idea that taxation could not be collected without consent of those being taxed. This was the driving factor in the foundation of the idea which would later be described as 'no taxation without representation'. This would lead to the foundation to the English Parliament, and whilst the Magna Carta would only be law for little more than three months this would be solidified as a political convention which would persist to the modern day. As time wore on the idea of parliamentary rights and popular sovereignty would intensify and by the 17th Century infractions made by Kings against the rights of the Lords and the Commons would become major incidents. None would be more so decisive than the storming of Parliament by Charles I in 1642 demanding the arrest of John Pym and four other rebellious MPs who rallied against the heavy and 'tyrannous' taxation. This would lead to Parliament rebelling against the King and the outbreak of the English Civil War. This war would combine with the currently rebelling Scottish religious dissidents and would spill over into Ireland, starting the War of the Three Kingdoms.

The War would result in a parliamentary victory, and the creation of the Commonwealth, a pseudo-Parliamentary Dictatorship headed by Oliver Cromwell and later his son Richard Cromwell as Lord Protectors. The Monarchy would eventually be restored in 1660 under Charles II. Charles would have to take a rather more cautious approach when dealing with Parliament, ultimately leading to three empowered parliaments, under Charles II. The English Parliament saw such a meteoric rise in its prevalence. Following the dissolution of Ireland and Scotland's Parliaments following the ascension of James II in 1685, the Parliament of England fearing a new 'Charles I' bitterly opposed James II and in 1688 invited the Stadtholder of the Dutch Republic, William III to overthrow King James II. In return for the support of the Parliaments of England and Scotland it is expected that William III will only increase the power of the Parliaments of the Three Kingdom. It may be of use for James II to promise similar liberties and rights to win back support of the hostile parliaments of England and Scotland. As of 1st January 1689, The Parliament of England is the only remaining Parliament currently sitting. Firmly loyal to William and Mary they could be a real centre of power or a thorn in your side

The history of the English Stuart Dynasty in Britain

Role of the Royal Dynasty in English Politics.

Between the Norman invasion of William I in 1066 and the Dutch invasion (or 'Glorious Revolution') of William III in 1688, England saw 27 sovereigns exercise authority over a kingdom expanding in population, territory and overseas influence. Though 'absolute monarchy' has always been checked either by aristocratic power (as in the numerous revolts of the 13th century) or by an emerging bourgeoisie, as can be evidenced in the 17th century, the crown nonetheless remains an important force within English Politics and the sovereign remains an important political player.

These 29 sovereigns that straddle the two Williams are broadly divided into Eight dynasties The House of Normandy (1066–1135) The House of Blois (1135–1154), The House of Anjou (1054–1216), The House of Plantagenet (1216–1399), The House of Lancaster and The House of York (1399–1485), The House of Tudor (1485–1603) and the present Stuart Dynasty (1603–1688). What follows here is a brief description of Royal power vis-à-vis other forces in society with each dynasty.

House of Normandy (1066–1135).

William I (r1066–1087). Died of illness aged 59.

William II (r1087–1100). Died in a 'hunting accident' aged c43–44.

Henry I (r1100–1135). Died of illness aged 66.

Much like William III, William I came to a new kingdom fully aware of challenges to his new reign. The conquest was not completed by a coronation in Westminster Abbey, much as it might be as a convenience for the historians, but was a process of subduing resistance and redistributing land, offices and ecclesiastical positions into more loyal (Norman) hands. Since these new Norman lords, numbering some less than 8000, owed continue military service to their sovereign in exchange for this land, William I's power

was substantial as can be demonstrated by the fact he likely spent less than half his reign in England, having numerous affairs on the continent to deal with. The legacy of this 'Norman Yoke' could be felt until the 17th century with what Christopher Hill calls the English Revolution, as shall be discussed later.

On his death William I split Normandy and England between his eldest sons Robert and William II (r1087–1100). After William II's death in a "hunting accident", Henry I (r1100–1135) came into conflict with Robert, and eventually reabsorbed the Duchy of Normandy into England. Henry I also began the substantial conquest of Wales, which would be completed by Edward I in 1283.

House of Blois (1135–1154).

Stephen (r1135–1154). Died of illness aged c60 years old.

After the death of Henry I's only legitimate son William in 1120, Henry demanded that his lords proclaim his daughter Matilda as Queen. However when Henry I died in 1135, Matilda was opposed by Stephen, Count of Blois, who was also the grandchild of William I through his mother Adela of Normandy. Matilda by 1135 was the widow of Holy Roman Emperor Henry V and spouse of Geoffrey of Anjou. We can thus see in England's first dynastic dispute since 1066, the ways in which foreign influences played as much of a role as legal disputes as to whether women could inherit the throne, not to mention the competing aristocratic interests that led different barons to choose different sides. The war was fought in northern France between the vassals of these great counts as much as it was by the English aristocracy. Additionally, in a fashion unprecedented and nearly unrepeated for many centuries to come, the 'crowd' entered the fray briefly when Matilda, unpopular in London, was run-out of town in 1141 just as she was on the cusp of victory over Stephen. This civil war lasted 18 years until, in 1153 by agreement at the Treaty of Winchester, Stephen agreed to make Henry of Anjou (r1154–1189) his heir, disinheriting his sons Eustace and William.

House of Anjou (1154–1216).

Henry II (r1154–1189). Died of illness while on campaign aged 56.

Richard I (r1189–1199). Died of crossbow wound while on campaign, aged 41.

John I (r1199–1216). Died of dysentery while on campaign aged 49.

Inheriting both the Duchy of Anjou, the Duchy of Normandy and the crown of England, and going on to conquer substantial portions of Ireland, Henry II in 1154 was one of the most powerful sovereigns in English Medieval history. However, forces opposed to him included the Church under Thomas Becket, and his own son Henry 'the young King' who was crowned co-ruler in 1170 but launched an armed revolt against his father in protest of the little power given to him, dying in the effort in 1183. Thus, even prior to Magna Carta in 1215, there were practical limitations on the power of sovereigns within territory they had power over. Richard I (r1189–1199) famously spent as little as six months of his reign in England, warring in France and the Holy Land or captured by the Holy Roman Emperor. This caused financial issues in Richard's reign which were continued into the reign of John I.

On Richard I's death, there was another, brief, succession crisis. For much of his life, Richard I had declared Arthur, Duke of Brittany, his heir, but in 1199 Arthur was just 12 years old, and so Richard I gave the throne to his younger brother John, who had exerted de facto governorship of England for much of Richard's reign. Phillip II of France recognised Arthur in his French possessions, leading to a civil war between uncle and nephew. John managed to capture Arthur in the conflict (and Arthur mysteriously disappeared afterwards). However, during the war with France, John lost many of his continental possessions, and had to raise taxes for his numerous attempts to take it back. The taxes John had to levy after 1204 for losing Normandy were unpopular with the barons and the Church, leading to disputes with both of them that placed real limitations on his power. The most famous of these limitations was Magna Carta, which, while only in legal affect for a very short period of time, formed the inspiration for many of the charters issued during the reign of Henry III, who was to succeed John.

House of Plantagenet (1216–1399).

Henry III (r1216–1272). Died of illness aged 65.

Edward I (r1272–1307). Died illness aged 68.

Edward II (r1307–1327). Died in captivity shortly after deposition aged 43.

Edward III (r1327–1377). Died of illness.

Richard II (r1377–1399). Died in captivity in 1400 shortly after deposition aged 33.

Historians distinguish the House of Anjou from the later Plantagenets after the death of King John in 1216 owing to the fact that Henry III was the first king to take the throne without substantial continental possessions (he still held Poitou and Gascony). Historians argue this led to a more 'English monarchy', with kings, particularly in the 13th century, focussing more of their attention on domestic affairs than prior.

Henry III initially conceded much ground to the Barons in the Charter of 1225 which substantially repeated the limitations on the power of the monarchy of the 1215 Charter. However the barons eventually saw in Henry the same autocratic instincts as his father, leading to numerous aristocratic revolts, and in 1258 Barons made their consent to future taxations conditional on Henry agreeing to the Provisions of Oxford (later Westminster) which imposed on Henry a 15 member Privy Council to oversee the administration of government. Henry III, like his father with Magna Carta, used the Pope to claim duress, annulling the provisions. This led to the Second Barons War (1263-7) during which time a French Earl by the name of Simon de Montfort had brief de-facto control of the country. During this time, Simon de Montfort summoned a Parliament which for the first time included representation beyond the aristocracy, bringing the 'Commons' into politics (this was not the commons of small urban artisans or rural peasants but rather knights and well-to-do merchants). Though suppressed, de Montfort's model was copied by Edward I in his 'Model Parliament' - an institution which developed in power over the course of the late 13th and 14th century.

Edward also unified England, Scotland and Wales. Completing decisively the conquest of Wales in 1283, Wales became a Principality bestowed on Edward II. The Prince of Wales ever since has been a title used for the heir apparent to the throne. He also temporarily succeeded at unifying England and Scotland between 1296-1306, planting the coronation stone of Scotland in the Coronation Chair at Westminster Abbey, which was placed over Edward the Confessor's tomb. This chair, a symbol of both unification of England and Scotland and continuity with Anglo-Saxon traditions.

The strength of Edward I's power was substantially undone by Edward II whom, suspected of being a homosexual, surrounded himself with young favourites who were unpopular with the aristocratic power. This led, in 1327, to the unprecedented situation of Isabella, Edwards French wife, deposing Edward II in league with her lover Roger Mortimer. Parliament, summoned in January 1327, was unsure as to how to proceed. They were under great popular pressure to replace Edward II with someone outside the royal family, and it was this threat that finally made Edward II succumb to abdication. Thus, without any established procedure, Parliament gave itself the authority to depose a King, a notion that would have shocked those rebelling against John I or Henry III. In captivity Edward II died in mysterious circumstances, most likely on the orders of Mortimer. Edward III, enraged at the murder of his father but unable to act until he

reached his majority, eventually avenged his father and had Mortimer executed in 1330 for assuming royal powers.

Edward III ruled for fifty years and was most famous for initiating the Hundred Years War in 1337 with his cousin Phillip VI of France, both of whom were descended from Phillip III of France (r1270-1283). Edward III claiming the throne of France for himself is the reason Kings of England as late as 1801 claimed the title 'King of France' although practical attempts to win this throne subsided by the mid 16th century. The financial strains caused by this war caused Parliament to definitely assert that no laws or taxes could be levied without Parliament's explicit consent, and this would mean Parliament could act as an effective check on unpopular or incompetent monarchs, regents and ministers. In 1341 for the first time Parliament also developed into a bicameral institution, with the Lords and the Commons sitting in separate chambers (then known as the 'Upper Chamber' and the 'Lower Chamber'). War and the need for frequent finance meant that Parliament was summoned often, and could thus provide an effective check on the King. The first recorded impeachment of a King's Minister dates from 1376, and this practice was widely extended during the reign of Richard II, Edward III's grandson.

The Houses of Lancaster and York

Henry IV (r1399-1413) (Lancastrian). Died of illness aged 45.

Henry V (r1413-1422) (Lancastrian). Died of illness aged 35. .

Henry VI (r1422-1461) (Lancastrian).

Edward IV (r1461-1470) (Yorkist).

Henry VI (r1470-1471) (Lancastrian)- second reign following defeat of Edward IV at Edgecote Moor. Died in captivity.

Edward IV (r1471-1483) (Yorkist)- second reign following defeat of Henry VI at Tewkesbury.

Edward V (r1483) (Yorkist)- disappeared in mysterious circumstances aged

Richard III (r1483-1485). (Yorkist)

The Wars of the Roses were a series of civil wars and usurpations commonly dated 1455-1485. However the origins of the conflict were in the death of Edward III, his numerous progeny and in particular the fact that Edward III's grandson Richard II, had no

son. Richard had planned to leave his cousin Mortimer heir, however Henry IV, son of John of Gaunt Duke of Lancaster, overthrew him in 1399 to take the throne for himself. As with Edward II, Richard II abdicated 'voluntarily' to add some veneer of legality to proceedings. As with Edward II, Richard died shortly after abdication in mysterious circumstances. Richards preferred heir, Mortimer, was seven years old in 1399 and thus was unable to press his claim ahead of Henry IV. Henry IV's rule was characterised by numerous domestic rebellions. His son, Henry V, won a decisive victory at Agincourt which made him the heir to Charles VI of France. This victory shored up the legitimacy of the Lancastrian dynasty in England. Henry V never took the French throne as he predeceased Charles VI by a few months, leaving the infant Henry VI in 1422 to sit both thrones. Henry VI gradually losing the throne of France in the 1430s, culminating in England losing all their continental possessions accepting Calais in 1453, undermined his rule at home, leading to the War of the Roses.

It was only the weakness of Henry VI, a king who spent much of his reign either a minor or mentally ill, that allowed differing descendants of Edward III to first compete for the regency, then, in the case of the Yorkists from 1461, the throne itself. These competing factions for power and influence were facilitated by an expanding aristocracy which allowed a growing number of 'King Makers' to use their military might to make and break kings. Notable 'King Makers' include Richard Neville, 16th Earl of Warwick, who was instrumental in both Edward IV taking the throne and Henry VI retaking it, and Thomas Stanley, 1st Earl of Derby, who helped Henry VII overthrow Richard III at Bosworth field in 1485.

Though Bosworth field is usually dated as the end of the Wars of the Roses, the last pitched battle took place in 1487 between the forces of Henry VII and the Earl of Lincoln, on behalf of a small boy claiming to be the missing Edward V. Edward III's numerous descendents would continue to disturb the reign of the Tudors until Richard de la Pole, who in league with the French planned two invasions of England in 1514 and 1523, died in 1525.

Tudors (1485-1603).

Henry VII (r1485-1509). Died of tuberculosis aged 52.

Henry VIII (r1509-1547). Died of illness aged 55.

Edward VI (r1547–1553). Died of tuberculosis aged 15.

Mary I (r1553–1558). Died of ovarian cancer aged 42.

Elizabeth I (r1558–1603). Died of sepsis aged 69.

Henry VII had taken the crown and ended the Wars of the Roses, though there were still several descendants of Edward III whom successive Tudor monarchs had to keep an eye on. Recognising that the principal causes of the Wars of the Roses was a weak monarchy and a strong aristocracy, Henry VII took steps to reverse this power imbalance. He married Edward IV's last living daughter, Elizabeth in 1486, unifying the red rose of Lancaster and the White rose of York into a new dynasty.

He also took numerous steps to centralise administration and governance in the hands of the monarch. Henry VII's priority was to avoid war with France, which had proved so costly during the reign of his predecessors, while collecting enough taxes to ensure England was financially stable enough to fight a war. He agreed new trade agreements with the Flemish and the Ottomans which greatly increased commerce and royal revenue, though in the former case at the expense of relations with the Pope. He also appointed Justices of the Peace in every shire of England. This ensured that the King's, or Parliaments, laws were upheld reducing the corruption and power of the aristocracy to enforce laws in their own interests. Many of these Justices were minor gentry, giving them another avenue into politics that would emerge further in the 17th century. Also of note Henry VII married his daughter Margaret to King James IV of Scotland. Margaret would become grandmother to Mary Queen of Scots and grandfather to James VI of Scotland and then James I of England.

While Henry VII is mainly remembered for strengthening the crown over a powerful aristocracy, Henry VIII, his son, is mainly remembered for strengthening the crown at the expense of the Church. This was initially done with the aim of stabilizing the dynasty with a male heir, in the context of a still active Yorkist threat. However the material affects of the English Reformation are notable. Sovereign power discernibly increased, as matters of theological dispute in England were now resolved by the Crown, not the Pope. Furthermore church lands, confiscated during the dissolution of the monasteries, went to those with the money to pay for them. This created a new bourgeois class, supportive of the Tudors but critical of any perceived return to Catholicism in the 17th century.

Between 1547 and 1558 England changed in religious disposition four times under successive monarchs. Henry's Church, despite separating from Rome in authority, was substantially Catholic in form, only making minor changes to pilgrimages and the iconoclasm of saints. Edward VI, influenced by more hardline Protestant advisors, advanced the Reformation by implementing officially Lutheran doctrines such as

justification by faith alone and the 1552 Book of Common Prayer. On Edward's death at the age of just 15 in 1553, his elder sister Mary succeeded him and renounced both the changes of her brother and her father, reuniting the Church with Rome and burned an estimated 300 Protestant heretics. Next to the Bible, Foxe's Book of Martyrs remains one of the best selling books in English in the 17th and 18th century. However this reunion with Rome could not be completed for Mary died childless in 1558. The Peace of Augsburg in 1555 had first established the principle of 'Cuius regio, eius religio' or in English 'whose realm, his religion'. It is interesting to consider that the fundamental religious nature of England would be different had either Edward VI or Mary I reigned longer than five years and had successors of their own.

In any event Elizabeth I succeeded to the throne in 1558 aged 25 and unmarried. England having lost Calais to France in January 1558, was now substantially a maritime, not a continental power, and it was during Elizabeth's reign that overseas trade and colonisation boomed. Elizabeth's support for merchants in the face of foreign, notably Spanish hostility, further strengthened the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the Tudor dynasty. In religious matters, she confirmed herself as the head of the Church of England while reintroducing the 1552 Book of Common Prayer with modifications to appease both Catholics and Lutherans. This settlement did not end religious strife in England, and it was a subject of serious contention during the reign of every subsequent monarch up to and including James II.

Though initially Catholicism was tolerated in Elizabeth's reign de facto if not de jure, the Papal Bull *Regnans in Excelsis* excommunicated Elizabeth I, proclaimed Mary Queen of Scots the rightful queen and freed English Catholics from obligations of loyalty to Elizabeth I.

This, in tandem with the discovery of a Catholic assassination plot against Elizabeth in 1571, which allegedly involved Pope Pius V, Phillip II of Spain and Mary Queen of Scots, led to increasingly harsh laws against Catholics, Catholic priests and those who would shelter them. Mary, great-granddaughter of Henry VI, had been a candidate to succeed Mary I in 1558, however her marriage to King Francis II of France, her Catholicism, and her youth all served to alienate everyone from her rule compared to Elizabeth. However, following *Regnans in Excelsis*, she was considered by many English Catholics to be the rightful Queen, and was the beneficiary of many conspiracies. Already in English custody following her forced abdication and exile in 1567, Mary was tried and executed in 1587. This left the way open for her Protestant son James VI of Scotland as heir apparent. Despite Elizabeth I never formally leaving an heir, James' succession in 1603 was largely unquestioned.

Stuarts (1603-1688)

James I (r1603–1625). Died of dysentery aged 58.

Charles I (r1625–1649). Sentenced to death and executed aged 48.

Charles II (r1649–1685) (de facto reign 1660–1685). Died of Apoplexy aged 54

James II (r1685–1688)– fled England in 1688.

An anecdotal account of James I hanging a pickpocket without trial on his journey south from Edinburgh for London is used to symbolise the different kind of monarchy the Stuarts aimed to impose on England. James I, a highly literate King, was imbued in ideas of the Divine Right of Kings, and this led him numerous times to clash with his Parliaments, or indeed go several years without ever calling one. James I was tolerant of Catholics at court, which would irk successive Protestant Parliaments. Additionally, the struggles of ruling an English Church and a Scottish Church which were, in form, slightly different, provided continuous struggles for his successors.

A brief digression about Ireland. Substantial portions of modern Ireland were conquered by Henry II, whom, like William I in England, created feudal portions of land under the 'Lordship' of John. However the remaining Gaelic petty kingdoms and lords would frequently launch attacks, indeed Richard II was famously distracted in Ireland when he was overthrown by Henry IV. The 100 years war and the War of the Roses diverted many forces which could have defended Irish holdings, with the result that Ireland was largely out of English control by 1500. The Fitzgerald dynasty had, for instance, crowned a Yorkist pretender to the throne in 1487 which necessitated an English response. In 1536 Henry VIII definitely decided to conquer the Ireland to prevent it becoming a base for foreign invasions or domestic insurrections. Ireland was upgraded from a lordship to a full Kingdom, and this vision gradually emerged into reality, the complete conquest not being complete until 1603. Following this successful conquest, James instituted a number of policies in Ireland, most notably the plantation of Ulster in which thousands of Scottish farmers demographically transformed historically the region most hostile to English rule to the most pliant. Despite Protestants also forming a majority in the English Parliament, attempts to religiously convert the population to Protestantism were largely a failure. Thus Ireland, throughout the 17th century, remained a land Catholic in disposition, but dominated by Protestant economic and political elites. This is an issue of importance to both the revolution of 1640–1660 and the Williamite Wars 1688–1691.

Charles I acceded to the throne in 1625 with numerous problems. As had been the custom since 1414, Parliament was supposed to vote Charles tonnage and poundage (i.e. import duties) for life. This would ensure a bare minimum income for the Crown for when Parliament was not in session. In reaction possibly to James' high handed approach to Parliament, Parliament was only willing to grant Charles I tonnage and poundage for one

year only, plus £140,000 for war with Spain. Plague meant Parliament was closed early and Charles in fact got no tonnage and poundage at all.

After two more Parliaments after 1625 both ended in acrimony, Charles reverted to personal rule from 1629–1640. During this time, he used a variety of creative means, such as levying 'ship money' on the entire United Kingdom rather than just coastal settlements. Attempts by John Hampden to evade this tax were popular with the public, and were only narrowly censured by the Star Chamber 7 judges to 5. Charles I also raised revenues by granting extensive monopolies to royal favorites, gouging merchants and consumers forced to pay higher prices while benefiting an existing landed elite. These merchants, who had favoured Tudor rule, were now alienated by a King who raised their cost of living and excluded them from the political process.

Religious issues also cropped up during personal rule as Charles advisor William Laud aimed to implement Arminianism within the Church of England and, more controversially, the Church of Scotland. This led to religious strife within England, notably the trial of William Prynne, John Bastwick and Henry Burton, whose theological criticisms of Laud led them to be branded and imprisoned for libel. In Scotland, it led to the formation of the National Covenant and the pledge by Scottish Bishops to resist any attempt to impose Laud's new liturgy within their churches with force if necessary. Scotland won both of 'The Bishops' Wars', and to defeat them without summoning a Parliament, Charles turned to the Irish Catholic gentry in order to raise forces without having to go to Parliament. This army went nowhere, however words of these negotiations soon reached Scotland and England, who were infuriated that Charles was willing to use Catholic troops against Protestant Scots. Many English Parliamentarians, hostile to Laud, were sympathetic with the Scottish cause.

Unable to raise a sufficient army to suppress the uprising on the finances he had managed to gain through non-parliamentary means, Charles was forced to recall Parliament, and Parliament unsurprisingly refused to grant him money without him agreeing to numerous reforms. During the Long Parliament (1640–1660) there was a Catholic revolt in Ireland in which many Protestants were violently murdered. This exacerbated Charles' need for money and troops, while also increasing Parliamentary hostility to Charles who, with a Catholic wife, was seen by Parliament as too soft on Catholics.

In January 1642, tired of the impasse, Charles tried to arrest 5 leading opposition MPs. The MPs had been tipped off and had evaded capture, and when Charles demanded to know where they were the Speaker of the House of Commons William Lenthall famously responded 'May it please your majesty, I have neither eyes to see, nor tongue to speak, in this place, but as the house is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am here; and I humbly ask pardon that I cannot give any other answer to what your majesty is pleased to demand of me'. Parliament's de jure role as an advisory chamber had come into contact with the de facto role it had evolved for itself since the 13th century as the

sovereign legislative body in English politics (note despite monarchical union, Scotland and England would have two separate Parliaments until 1707).

The question remains why the Parliamentarians of the 1640s, whose grandparents had been staunch supporters of the Tudor monarchy, suddenly found themselves at odds with the Stuarts. Some characterise this to the obstinacy of Charles I, and this in itself is a factor. However Christopher Hill speculates that the development of private industry gave rise to the bourgeoisie. We have already seen the merchant class steadily gain power under Edward I, Edward III and the Tudors, however Hill argues that during the Stuart period, provoked in part by the monarch's high handed approach to governance, this class sought to dominate politics whereas before they were merely one of the actors. In any case, the execution of Charles I in 1649 and Parliament's invitation for Charles II to return in 1660 made it clear that, in their eyes, the King ruled not by the grace of God but with their own permission. This was articulated in numerous 'social contract' theories of government of the 17th century, notably with Thomas Hobbes and John Locke.

The restoration settlement of 1660 agreed that Charles would receive a fixed income every year from customs, however he could not levy further taxes without Parliamentary approval. As with numerous previous monarchs, Charles II's active foreign policy, fighting two unsuccessful wars against the Dutch Republic, required the frequent summoning of Parliament for further sums of money, and therefore increased Parliament's ability to meddle in Royal affairs. Notable conflicts between King and Parliament include the impeachment and imprisonment of Lord High Treasurer Danby in 1679 and the Exclusion Crisis between 1679-1681 in which Parliament passed bills to exclude James Duke of York, Charles' younger Catholic brother from the throne. Charles used his royal prerogative to dissolve Parliament each time these bills were passed, however he still had to keep summoning Parliament for additional funds. Eventually his cousin Louis XIV of France solved this issue for him by granting him a pension which allowed him to maintain his lavish lifestyle without summoning a Parliament between 1681-1685.

Charles II converted to Catholicism on his deathbed and was resolute that his younger brother James was his heir, not any of his bastard children. James Scott, the Duke of Monmouth, the oldest known bastard child of Charles II, attempted to rally the Protestants to his cause, launching a failed rebellion in the summer of 1685 which resulted in his own death. James II had not yet alienated the population with his reforms. The reaction to this rebellion- known as the 'Bloody Assizes' in which 150 rebels were executed, began this process of alienation.

It's clear that James II aspired to be a more active monarch than his older brother. While Charles II had seen the army, particularly the radical presbyterian element, as a threat to his power, James II saw a standing army as the best means for his security. James II also aspired to allow Catholics into the army in contradiction of the 1673 'Test Acts'. The

prospect of a large, Catholic army, not fighting on the continent, but stationed in England, alienated many previously sympathetic to James during the Exclusion crisis. While some may see this as toleration for a religious minority, others saw this as the King ignoring Parliament, which was dissolved in acrimony in 1687 and not recalled, James II taking payments from Louis XIV in order to finance a non-parliamentary regime. As well as alienating the Protestant bourgeoisie with his desire to rebuild England as some sort of Catholic power, James II also alienated the Church of England Bishops with his demand that they read his April 1688 Declaration of Indulgence at their services. James II hoped that this declaration would win over the support of both Catholics and dissenting Protestants, however combined these religious groups made up less than 10% of the English population, and James' policies were alienating both high church Tories and low church Whigs. When Seven Bishops, including the Archbishop, wrote to James asking him to reconsider, they were arrested and imprisoned for seditious libel. Their acquittal on June 30th demonstrated James' limited power over the judiciary, despite his many attempts to pack the judiciary with his supporters.

Unlike the numerous occasions in history when the lack of a male heir causes conflict, the emergence of one in June 1688 with the birth of Prince James. The Protestant ascendancy had assumed that James' daughters Mary and Anne, both staunch Protestants, would succeed James, and that his efforts at tolerance and restoring the Catholic Church in England would be but a brief aberration in history, much like Mary I's reunion with Rome between 1553 and 1558. However, the potential 'James III', raised Catholic, could form the foundations of a Catholic dynasty. This, combined with the prosecution of the Seven Bishops, were the immediate triggers for the letter to William III written by a bipartisan coalition of Whigs and Tories who had been gradually alienated from James II. William, James' II son in law, sensing a Protestant uprising that would not be controlled by him, sailed across the Channel and landed in Torbay in November 1688. William III, as well as securing his wife Mary on the throne ahead of her infant brother, also hoped to pull the English military might on the side of the Dutch in their ongoing war against France. James II's Royal Army, initially numbering 30,000 to William's 14,000, was gradually whittled down by desertions, including notably John Churchill who had helped him defeat the Monmouth rebellion, to just 4,000. Rather than do battle against such odds, James II did not strictly speaking abdicated, but rather, to avoid further bloodshed for now, fled to France, dropping the Great Seal in the Thames.

Conclusion

The power of the monarchy has ebbed and flowed over time, in part affected by material conditions but also by the will of certain monarchs to preserve and enhance their own power in relation to foreign powers, the church, the nobility and the bourgeoisie. As the actions of, and reactions to, the Stuarts indicate, the monarchs and royal dynasties of these times were not irrelevant symbols but rather active players in English politics. What the story of numerous previous dynasties should show us is that there has never been an

'absolute' monarch who has been able to rule without the need to ally themselves to one or more of the power factions within their kingdom. Monarchs that aim to rule without alliances, or with weak alliances, tend not to sit their throne very long.

Further Reading

<https://www.historic-uk.com/HistoryUK/KingsQueensofBritain/> – useful family tree

Royal family Tree– <https://www.britroyals.com/royalfree.asp>

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/hill-christopher/english-revolution/>– Christopher Hill, 1940, The English Revolution.

<https://theyorkhistorian.com/2017/09/29/the-norman-yoke-uses-of-the-past-during-the-english-civil-war/>– Uses of the Norman Yoke in the 17th century.

Foreign Relations and Economic Situation in Britain

Economic situation of Britain

Britain at this pivotal point in its history is a curious mix of economic powers both at home and away.

Domestic Production

Huge swathes of England and Scotland are dedicated to the production of cloth and wool for export across Europe and Britain itself. So reliant is the English crown on the export of these products that several conflicts have been seen in the past with France and the dukes of the Lowlands over where wool may be bought and sold on the continent and at what precise price.

Wales, like a great deal of the midlands, sees a far more diverse economic layout with large reliance seen on both livestock and mining for resources like Iron. Both the farming and mining traditions of the Welsh are more ancient than any of the political boundaries seen in our Britain of the 17th Century. For instance, the primary cause of Roman expansion into the region was the gold mines of Dolaucothi.

Ireland however sees itself almost entirely dedicated to the production of foodstuffs; livestock, grain, fish, all to be found in the emerald isle. Somewhat unfortunately however, this natural

Foreign relations of Britain

Britain's place in the vast community of nations that make up Europe in the late 17th century is as ever a complex one.

To start at the top of the political ladder, the current king of England, Scotland and Ireland is William of Orange, who also happens to be the Stadtholder of the United Provinces of the Netherlands. Whilst a certainly odd turn of events, there is a very good reason that the premier of the Netherlands would want to be king.

Up until this point, King James II had been pursuing a very aggressively friendly foreign relations campaign to forge an alliance with the kingdom of France. This would have severely threatened the integrity of the firmly reformed and protestant Dutch Republic. Whilst an alliance with France may seem beneficial to Britain on the surface, being such a large power on the continent, it would in fact be disastrous for the Anglican ruling class of parliament.

Internal relations and Politics for England

All in all, the 17th century was a time of political turmoil and upheaval, charged by religious and monarchical tensions amongst the Three Kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland. The first Stuart monarch, James VI, believed in a "centralised state" run absolutely by a monarch through divine right. As such, the Royal Prerogative tended to override Parliament during Stuart rule.

Prior to the Civil War, the English people overwhelmingly identified with the Church of England and supported monarchy. 95% of Scotland identified with the Church of Scotland or Kirk, and Ireland remained predominantly Catholic. Due to the association between Catholicism and Louis XIV's absolutist policies and the revocation of tolerance for French Protestants, English Protestants were threatened by the idea of a Catholic counter-reformation.

The Wars of the Three Kingdoms (1638–51), culminating in the execution of Charles I (1649) and instating of the Commonwealth dominated by religious independents such as Oliver Cromwell, resulted in a country intolerant of state-ordered religion. In 1660, the Restoration led by Charles II reinstated both the crown through the return of Charles II as well as the church.

However, controversy surrounding Charles II's brother and heir presumptive, James II, led to the Exclusion Crisis from 1679–81. James was unpopular due to his Roman Catholicism and had publicly refused to take the oath prescribed by the Test Act. Three Exclusion bills were made, however none passed. As a result, two new parties formed: the pro-exclusion Whigs, and the anti-exclusion Tories. Despite his Catholicism, most Tories saw the king's religion as less important than the principle of hereditary succession. However this sentiment was not extended to other Catholics. In 1681, the Scottish Succession Act confirmed that, "regardless of religion", James was the legal heir, however with addition of to "promise to uphold the true Protestant religion" in the Scottish Test Act.

In 1683, the monarchy swung back into favour after the discovery of The Rye House Plot, which intended to assassinate Charles and James. Implicated were severable notable Whigs including the King's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth, who were forced to flee into exile. Charles then increased the repression of Whigs and dissenters and invited him onto the privy council in 1684.

In 1685, James II succeeded his late elder brother, who had converted to Catholicism on his deathbed. Although widely popular, two rebellions soon arose: the Monmouth Rebellion – led by the Duke of Monmouth – and Argyll's Rising, led by Archibald Campbell. Both figures had returned from Holland, where William the Orange had neglected to detain them. Argyll's Rising failed as he failed to recruit more than 300 men, most of which were from his own Campbells. Argyll was taken prisoner and sentenced to death. The Monmouth rebellion was coordinated to occur at the same time as the Argyll's, and the Duke proclaimed himself the true King on 11 June. However, James defeated him at the Battle of Sedgemoor, and proceeded to execute both the Duke and some 250 rebels. To protect himself from future rebellions, James began enlarging his standing army, despite doing such being against tradition.

Domestically, the new king initially proved quite popular despite concerns of his religious affiliations. He conciliated with Protestants who remained loyal to his family during the Exclusion Crisis, as well as the church-and-crown loyalists, otherwise known as Tories. However, before the year came to an end, James II began to enact more controversial pluralist policy. In England, he began suspending the operation of penal laws against Catholic, granting Catholics places in government, university and the army. In 1687 he introduced a Declaration of Indulgence offering religious toleration towards individuals outside of the establish church. When the Scottish and English Parliaments refused to repeal the Test Acts of 1678 and 1681, James suspended Parliament in November 1685 in order to rule by decree, dismissing judges who disagreed with such an action.

At the centre of the controversy was the removal of his Tory brother-in-law lord lieutenant Clarendon in Ireland, who was replaced by close friend and ambitious Irish Catholic Richard Talbot, earl of Tyrconnel. With his power consolidated, Talbot began replacing Protestants in power with loyal Catholics in order to ensure indisputable loyalty to James. This was done in order to ensure that a Catholic establishment would survive after James' death, but neither James nor Talbot intended to establish an absolutist state. However, the actions of both James and Talbot deeply concerned the British Protestants.

The years of 1686–1688 were rife with actions perceived as attacks on the Church of England. After refusing to ban a chaplain from preaching after an anti-Catholic sermon, the Bishop of London, Henry Compton, was suspended. The revival of the Court of High Commission, the Ecclesiastical Commission, which was responsible of regulating the church, contained numerous suspected Catholics. The king continued to replace positions of powers with Catholics, especially any Protestants who voiced opposition. He further created a "King's Party" of Catholics and Dissenters, ignoring the fact that they cumulatively only composed less than 5% of the English population, and less so in Scotland. Moreover, some Dissenters such as Quakers and Congregationalists wanted to re-enter the Church of England. James II's support base became increasingly narrow.

Tensions between rival factions ultimately culminated into the Glorious Revolution of November 1688, in which James II was overthrown. Two events catalysed the crisis: the prospect of a Catholic dynasty through the birth of James Francis Edward, and the acquittal of the Seven Bishops 20 days later in June 1688. William of Orange, James' Protestant son-in-law and relative, arrived from Holland to overthrow the King. Two factions were formed: The Jacobites, who fought to keep James and the House of Stuart in power, and the Williamites, who supported William's claim to the throne. Many of James' men deserted to William's side, and on the 9th of December the King decided to flee to France, arriving on its shores on the 22nd of December.

However, James intends on returning to the throne, and still has substantial support in Ireland, where 75% of the population was still Catholic.

References:

Coffey, John (author), Pope, Robert (editor) (2013). *Church & State 1570–1750; the Emergence of Dissent in T&T Clark Companion to Nonconformity* (2016 ed.). Chapter 4: Bloomsbury T&T Clark. pp. 19–20. [ISBN 978-0567669933](#).

Hammersley, Rachel (2005). *French Revolutionaries and English Republicans: The Cordeliers Club, 1790–1794*. Royal Historical Society. [ISBN 978-0861932733](#).

Wormsley, David (2015). *James II: The Last Catholic King*. Allen Lane. [ISBN 978-0141977065](#).

Harris, Tim (2006). *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685–1720*. Allen Lane. [ISBN 978-0-7139-9759-0](#).

Clarke, Nigel J. (1985). *Monmouth's West Country Rebellion of 1685*. Nigel J Clarke Publications. [ISBN 978-0-907683-17-9](#).

Willcock, *A Scots Earl in Covenanting Times*, 1907

Troost, Wout, *William III, The Stadholder-king: A Political Biography* (2005) (translation by J. C. Grayson) [ISBN 0-7546-5071-5](#)

Van der Kiste, John, *William and Mary* (2003) [ISBN 0-7509-3048-9](#)

Military Capabilities and History

Armies of the late 17th century

Armies, and more pertinently, the men who comprised them had changed a great deal by the 1680s from what they had been several decades earlier. The armies which had fought the Thirty Years War had been comprised almost entirely of mercenary bands, recruited privately by a general who would then hire out his services to a ruler. However, these forces had often proved unreliable. Therefore, by the 1680s many nations had created a certain number of standing, professional formations of soldiers who were sworn to fight only for the ruler who they now served.

However, whilst this development did sow the seeds of the later European national armies, comprised solely of subjects serving their nation in the military, armies of the 17th century were still very far from this. Whilst the men within them now fought for a ruler rather than a general, it was by no means a given that these men would be from the ruler's own nation. Indeed, it wasn't unheard of for up to 50% of an army to be foreign-born, with many men from the poorer areas of Europe (such as Germany, Ireland and Switzerland) leaving their homelands to try and find employment in other ruler's armies. In fact, to a certain extent, many ruler's preferred these foreign-born troops, as it was thought they would be more willing to inflict violence on the ruler's subjects in order to maintain law and order and every foreigner in a ruler's army was one more of his subjects who paid taxes to him rather than being paid by him.

As a consequence, in many armies the enlisted ranks were a mish-mash of foreign-born mercenaries, men for whom the army was their only means of employment and men press-ganged or conscripted into service. By contrast, the men who officered these armies were, in almost all cases, were drawn from the aristocrats of a nation or, in some cases, exiled aristocrats who had found protection with a ruler. These men thought themselves uniquely well qualified, by birth and education, to lead the lower levels of society. However, this does not necessarily mean that the stereotype of the incompetent aristocrat, overpromoted and only in a position of authority due to birth, is in any way accurate. Few aristocratic officers lacked for courage, with leadership by example being expected, and as a result casualties among officers typically were higher than those in the ranks.

However, what these aristocratic officers, brave though many undoubtedly were, lacked was an understanding of the more technical aspects of war which, in this time period, principally applied in the artillery. Therefore, whilst officers in the infantry and cavalry were virtually all aristocrats, in the artillery, where a greater degree of education was needed, there were a higher proportion of middle class men, not rich enough to buy their way into the prestige of an infantry or cavalry officer but willing to engage in the "grubby" work of officering artillery that aristocrats typically disdained.

On the field, these armies were limited by their relatively primitive communications. Every order that a commander gave had to be relayed by a messenger or by instruments and as a consequence, armies of much above 40,000 men tended to be deemed uncontrollable. Even with armies this "small", it was not at all unusual for commanders to lose control of the battle, particularly as their picture of the battlefield was limited to what they could themselves see or on reports given to them by messengers who could be killed or get lost on their way.

As a result, in many cases, battles fought by 17th century armies can often be described by the Duke of Wellington's famous statement "A hard pounding gentlemen! We shall see who can pound the longest!". Whilst commanders could seek to maximise their chances of victory by their actions both prior to and during a battle, to an extent the result of a battle came down to the discipline and morale of the individual regiments and battalions, with the side able to endure the longest often emerging the victor. To this extent, a large part of a general's job was carried out off the battlefield, ensuring his soldiers had enough food, were paid on time and maintained their morale prior to the battle and in selecting ground which best benefited his troops.

Infantry in the late 17th century

Of the three key arms of early modern armies, the infantry was the one which had undergone the most visible transition by the late 17th century. At the beginning of the 1600s, infantry formations had been comprised of both pikemen and musketeers, with the precise ratio varying from army to army, with the musketeers providing a large volume of firepower to inflict casualties on enemy infantry formations whilst they were protected from enemy cavalry by their accompanying pikemen. However, by the late 1600s, the pike had all but been phased out of use, with virtually every army having reduced the number of pikemen in their infantry battalions to only 1 in 10, or even fewer (the only notable exception being Sweden) and in many armies the pike was phased out of use altogether at some stage in the first decade of the 18th century.

In place of the pike and shot formations, the infantry had transitioned to what is now known as "line infantry". In these units, the overwhelming majority of the men took to the field equipped with muskets and the new plug bayonets, which when affixed to the end of a soldier's musket turned it into a rudimentary spear, allowing musket armed infantry to withstand cavalry charges without the need of pike protection. This transition of the infantry to a force equipped primarily with ranged weapons led to an evolution of tactics in which there were three principle formations employed by the infantry: the line, the square and the column.

The first of these formations, the line, was a formation in which the infantry would deploy in long formations which were only two to four men deep. The advantage and intent of this formation was to maximise the firepower that any given infantry unit could bring to bear on opposing formations. However, the line had the disadvantage that once deployed in a line, it was relatively difficult for soldiers to redeploy into a square if faced with cavalry and line formations tended to lack staying power when faced with an enemy bayonet charge, although well-disciplined troops were able to mitigate both of these issues. The square was a formation in which the infantry would form a hollow square of four lines between two and four men deep facing outwards, with the men in the front rank(s) kneeling, bayonets fixed, whilst the men to the rear kept firing. This formation was designed to and very good at withstanding cavalry charges. However, it left the troops deployed in it very vulnerable to fire from either artillery or other infantry. The third and final formation typically used was the column. In this, the infantry advanced in a column that was generally deeper than it was wide. Vulnerable to artillery, particularly at close range, and unable to bring the full weight of an infantry unit's firepower to bear, the column was principally useful in an advance, before the infantry came into range of enemy musketry. There are a number of reasons for this. The first is that it was easier for the infantry to redeploy into a line or square as the situation required from the column than either of the other formations. The second is that the sheer depth of these formations tended to make them more resilient to cavalry even if the troops were unable to form square and psychologically, this depth tended to both bolster the morale of the troops in the column (a by no means inconsiderable benefit when they would need to advance under fire) and intimidate enemy troops. Indeed, it was not unheard of for troops deployed in lines to break simply at the sight of enemy columns. However, if an enemy force deployed in lines was disciplined enough to hold its ground in the face of a column, then it could wreak terrible damage on the column, which would be unable to bring its full firepower to bear unless it redeployed and if it did redeploy would need to do so

under fire.

These three formations formed the building blocks of infantry tactics in the late 17th and 18th centuries and whilst, in theory, the infantry was trained to redeploy from and into them quickly and smoothly, in practice many commanders preferred to remain in the same formation if at all feasible. The reason for this comes down to the nature of the late 17th century battlefield. Unlike modern wars, where many armies have equipped their troops with individual radios, no such technology was available to 17th century commanders, all of whose orders needed to be relayed by word of mouth or by instruments, with both of these methods likely to remain unheard in the midst of battle, even with formations which were designed to lessen the risk of orders going unheard. Therefore, any change of formation in battle was likely to be a chaotic process which, if performed under fire, may well shatter the morale of even the most disciplined infantry unit and even if the unit remained unbroken, could cause it to lose cohesion, which would render it effectively useless for anything aside from holding its ground until its officers managed to regroup their men into some form of collective formation and order.

This desire to keep troops formed up and units cohesive led, in part, to the advent and use of the bayonet charge, which was to become a popular way in which the infantry could clear and hold enemy positions. Troops could advance in column until within charging distance (a few dozen metres of the enemy or "once you see the whites of the enemy's eyes" as the Swedish army put it) of the enemy formation. At this point, the column could affix bayonets and charge, at which stage its "weight" would smash through enemy line formations, who would be forced to withdraw. At least that was the theory. In practice, this manoeuvre was difficult to perform simply due to human psychology. Almost all humans are extremely reluctant to fix a long piece of sharpened steel onto the end of their musket and charge into a situation where combat will be decided by one party's willingness to drive said piece of steel through the other's throat or body when they could instead simply keep firing their musket and hope for the best. In order to persuade a human to do so takes extreme discipline, often paired with a strong sense of motivation instilled by any number of other factors, be they regimental pride, religious fervour or even the charisma of an individual officer. Therefore, it was rare for any infantry to be able to successfully carry out bayonet charges regularly and repeatably, two notable exceptions being the British and Swedish infantry. However, if infantry could successfully execute a bayonet charge, it rarely resulted in melee, as if it became clear that an attacking force was disciplined and determined enough to charge, the defenders tended to break and flee for the same reasons why attackers tended to be reluctant to charge.

Cavalry of the late 17th century

Like the infantry, the cavalry of the late 17th century functioned significantly differently how it had done in earlier periods. However, in the case of the cavalry this was the result of a long process of transition rather than a sudden change as had happened with the infantry. Ever since the late mid-16th century, European cavalry had been transitioning from the heavily armoured knights of the early Renaissance to a more lightly armed force, which had largely abandoned armour as a result of the increasing power of firearms (although some units did still wear breastplates, often for appearances sake only).

The crucial factor changing the utility of cavalry on the battlefield was the increasing professionalism and so discipline of infantry within European armies. With this discipline and formations such as the square (which relied on this discipline to function), the willingness and ability of infantry to withstand cavalry charges had increased to the point where cavalry charges were no longer able to guarantee success against formations of infantry. There were still circumstances under which cavalry charges could succeed against infantry, such as when executed against disordered infantry or, with enough speed and aggression, against infantry deployed in line formations. However, even against infantry in line formations, unless timed correctly, cavalry charges could incur dreadful losses from musket fire, even if successful. An additional disadvantage of cavalry charges from a command and control perspective was that once unleashed, it was very difficult to recall cavalry, turning it into almost a one-use weapon, although commanders did attempt to rectify this with some degree of success.

However, whilst the cavalry charge was still talked of and something which many cavalrymen aspired to take part in, the principle uses of cavalry in the 17th century had transformed into those of reconnaissance and screening, principally tasks carried out before and after battle. Naturally, troops mounted on horses were able to move more swiftly than men on foot and so they were often sent out ahead of the main army to keep their commander's aware of both the terrain ahead and of enemy movements. Alternatively, they could also be sent to the army's flanks and rear to try and impede enemy reconnaissance and keep the enemy blind to their own army's movements. Likewise, on the battlefield they could be deployed to the flanks of the army to defend them from any enemy attempts at flanking if the army's flanks were not protected by any natural features.

During battle, if they were not required, or not all required, to protect the army's flanks, many commanders would typically keep a cavalry reserve for the final stages of the battle. This reserve would typically serve one of two purposes, depending on the outcome of the battle: rear-guard or harassment. If a commander's infantry had managed to break through the enemy positions and scatter the enemy infantry, then the victorious commander would often send forward his cavalry reserve to overrun the enemy artillery and run down as much of the enemy infantry as possible. By contrast, the defeated commander would use his cavalry to defend against just such an attempt, using it to buy time for his infantry to reorganise itself and withdraw in formation alongside his infantry. As the enemy withdrew and for any length of time afterwards, the victorious army's cavalry would typically pursue the defeated army, keeping up the pressure and not allowing them any time to rest and reorder themselves, in some cases even seeking to channel them in a certain direction, typically by attacking and attempting to destroy reconnaissance patrols sent out in directions other than the desired one, forcing the enemy commander to take the route about which he had information and which seemed free of the enemy.

Artillery in the 17th century

A relatively new addition to warfare, the artillery of the late 17th century was the most technical branch of any army. Unlike the infantry and cavalry, whose roles revolved around use of manoeuvre to defeat the enemy, the artillery of the late 1600s was highly immobile. Once positioned for a battle, it was extremely difficult to move artillery and took a great deal of manpower, horsepower and time. Therefore, the artillery would not tend to move until the battle was concluded one way or another and in retreat, a commander's most difficult job after keeping his army intact was to withdraw his artillery.

The artillery of the late 17th century principally fired two kinds of ammunition: round shot and canister shot. Round shot was the artillery's principle ranged projectile, consisting of a simple solid iron ball. Whilst psychologically very effective, as it could have horrendous effects when it came into contact with humans and was very visible when coming towards troops (who, because of the attitudes of the day, would have had no way of minimizing their risk of being hit other than trusting their luck or prayer), roundshot tended to create very few actual casualties, even in the densely packed infantry formations of the day. The second type of ammunition used by the artillery was known as grapeshot and consisted of dozens of musket balls packed into the cannon, effectively turning the cannon into an enormous shotgun when fired. Whilst only effective at relatively close range (under 100 metres), the effect that grapeshot had on densely packed formations of infantry and cavalry was devastating. As a result, artillery tended to have two uses on the battlefield: harassment and defence. At range, roundshot was used to keep enemy sectors of the line where there was no fighting under pressure, stopping them from being able to rest easy or manoeuvre without fear of being hit. This made reforming units or even moving them more difficult and gradually wore away at the morale of the troops on the receiving end of the artillery, with protracted bombardments often breaking anyone aside from the most disciplined troops. Meanwhile, on the defensive, artillery firing grapeshot served to augment the firepower of the defending infantry, attempting to inflict sufficient casualties on attacking infantry that their morale broke and they withdrew. A subsidiary benefit was that the monstrous casualties inflicted by grapeshot would blow enormous holes in the enemy ranks which they would be required to fill and compensate for as they advanced over their own dead and injured, slowing the overall pace of the advance and sometimes even making such a mess of enemy formations that a further advance was simply impossible, even with troops whose morale and discipline was strong enough to allow one.

However, one weakness of 17th century was its limitation to direct fire. That is to say that, unlike modern artillery, 17th century artillery could not fire upon an enemy which it could not see directly.

Jacobite Armies

King James II's army, following the Glorious Revolution, was a hodge podge of forces whose loyalty he could still command and as a consequence, there was little in the way of standardisation. However, as a general rule, Jacobite troops were less well equipped than their Williamite counterparts, with about 1 infantryman in every 4 being a pike man and the musketeers being equipped with outdated matchlock muskets. In addition, the Jacobites were unable to bring as much artillery to bear as their Williamite counterparts.

Two areas where the Jacobites did have a substantial advantage was in the loyalty of their troops, who, having chosen to support James II even after he was deposed, could generally be deemed reliable, and in the quality of their cavalry, generally composed of Catholic gentry. As a consequence, much like the Royalist cavalry of the English Civil War, the Jacobite cavalry was composed of gentlemen who had been riding for much of their life and were consequently far superior horsemen than their Williamite counterparts, even if they were less disciplined.

When its weaknesses and strengths are examined, the Jacobite army can be deemed to effectively be a glass cannon. Its infantry would be at a great advantage in close quarters due to their heavy proportion of pikemen and its cavalry was likely to be able to drive the Williamite cavalry off the field. However, the cavalry would be difficult to control once unleashed and if the infantry could be kept at range or forced into a protracted engagement, then their comparative lack of discipline and technological backwardness would see them defeated by their Williamite counterparts. So a Jacobite commander ought to try and hit hard and fast and not get bogged down or drawn into a protracted engagement under any circumstances.

Williamite Armies

The armies of King William III and Queen Mary were, unlike those of the Jacobites, a thoroughly modern fighting force. In stark contrast to the Jacobite infantry, the Williamite infantry had all but phased out the pike, with it being reduced to a symbol of rank carried by NCOs, equipping the bulk of the infantry with flintlock muskets, which were both quicker to fire and less susceptible to the elements than matchlock muskets, and bayonets. In addition to the superior quality of his troops' equipment, William III had brought with him a large number of Danish and Dutch troops, experienced soldiers who had fought in the wars against Louis XIV's France and had access to large numbers of artillery pieces.

The principal problem for William III was the loyalty, or potential lack thereof, of the British troops who comprised around 2/3 of his army. Whilst he had around 7,000 Danish and a similar number of Dutch troops on whom he knew he could rely, his native British troops had only months earlier been in service of his enemy, King James II. As a consequence, their will to fight was very much in question.

However, even in light of the relative untrustworthiness of the British Williamite troops, all of William's troops had the advantage of being professional, disciplined troops. As a consequence, they would be unlikely to immediately break if the battle seemed to be going against them or they sustained heavy losses and they would be easier to exert command and control over. Therefore, a Williamite commander ought to seek to draw the Jacobites into a protracted engagement where the Williamite advantages of discipline and firepower will gradually wear down the Jacobite army.