

The ENGLISH ~~REVOLUTION~~ Revolution

The English Civil War

In 17th century European state system

entered into a two-dimensional phase.

As a result of European Reformation Movement, emergence of Absolute Monarchy faced

strong opposition from entire State System or

State Machinery of England. According to

recent research, the old opinion of English

Revolution has been discarded, during the

middle phase of 17th c., the great clash

between Parliament and Charles I was

categorised as English Revolution. Death

or rather murder of Charles I had great

social, political and intellectual implication.

Transformation of social and political

background, according to Frederick

Engles, English Civil War was nothing

but a Bourgeoisie Rev. After
Charles I's death, English Monarchy
never regained its earlier prestige
and glory.

Most dramatic part of 17th c
European History was English Civil War

There are lots of controversies
regarding the origin of the Revolution

Harrington said or opined the War
was a transfer of power from
old Aristocrat to Neo Aristocrat.

Old Aristocrats were the main strength
of Monarchy. So their decline
and gradually diminishing power

was one of the key reasons for

Civil War, 17th c. witnessed

worst-ever conflict between Parliament
and Monarchy.

Neo-Zamindars were main associates of revolutionaries.

According to Harrington Civil war had a strong perspective.

In the year 1960, C. Hill, Eric Hobsbawm

(Marxist Historians) described E. R.

as Bourgeoisie Revolution. Marxist

interpretation of English Revolution had similarities with Whigs.

Background of Civil War and its social characteristics

~~Background~~ Historians had an inner sense that

~~during 1640~~ way back 1640 lot of complexities

and loss of popular support culminated

in the outburst of England (Civil War).

Expulsion of Thomas Cromwell, resulted

in collapse of English Monarchy into two

warring groups. Reign of Elizabeth -

Enough sign for the outbreak of Civil

War. Ever-increasing demand of

Puritanism - exhausted exche

Gardiner while assessing the role of parliament,

commented that English Civil War was the

first revolution against existing state system.

English Revolution can be designated as the first

liberal Revolution but there is huge difference -

between 19th c. Parliamentary democracy

and 17th c. Revolution. In 1628 "Petition of

Rights" protested against absolute power

of Monarchy. According to Gardiner

E. R. was the conflict between two ideas

and this conflict had a greater ideological

and social ~~point~~ perspective. A Clarendon

had self-contradictory views about Revolution

Majority of anti-Monarch ~~were~~ basically

ambitious common people. Clarendon

described them as lesser Men

According to Tony, Civil War was nothing but a confrontation between newly emerging rich class and power-mongers aristocrat who controlled the administration. For this perspective Clarendon

opined that "Parliamentary leaders were for the most part clothiers and men who thought they are rich, had not been before of power or

reputation there - - though they are rich had not been before of power or reputation there;

though gentlemen of ancient families and estates - were for the most part well affected to the king -

yet these were a people of an inferior degree

who by good husbandry, clothing and other

thriving arts had got very great fortunes

and by degrees getting themselves into the gentlemen's estates - - - These from the beginning

were fast friends to the Parliament" While

^{Explaining}
~~explaining~~ Social implication of Civil War (Tony)

indicated the rise of Brentay, Clarendon

also supported it.

Forever Roper and Kevin Sharpe
edited Faction of Parliament was

an example: enough to prove the
moot point that Civil War was a
war between "Court and Country"

Within the political structure of
England inherent conflict between
general people and members of monarchy

existed in a hidden way. Within
the State System/Monarchical system of
Europe, specially in England, political
system was monitored by rich people
of city and affluent people of country.

Regional uniqueness and centralised
Monarchy had always their spirit
of resistance and conflicts.

In 1620, condition changed

when they felt. There is ~~not~~ a lot of disparity
and continuous political pressure compelled them
to build a spirit of resistance against

oppression by Monarchical Structure: Queen
centralisation; buttressed by king and his
associates culminated in spreading and

Converting Civil War into an all embracing
Revolution.

John Morrill in his book Revolt of the
Revolution focussed - tremendous powerful
presentation of regionalism ~~to~~ made the entire
social perspective more complex and dissenting.

Anthony Fletcher in his book "The Outbreak
of the English Civil War" also supported
this viewpoint.

In spite of general anger, general public
was still then respectful towards monarchy.

John Morrill in his Nature of the English

Revolution, described: while
discussing religious perspective of English
Civil War - the situation of distrust between
common people and Monarchy resulting in
Revolt against Monarchical power was
very much latent in religious distrust
rather constitutional conflict. Puritan
members thought ~~that~~ ^{that} Charles was unable
to maintain religious responsibility

Bishop had adopted religious policy
welcomed a deep hatred and tyrannical
attitude of Charles culminated into
a catastrophe of English History -

commonly called as English Re / English
Civil War. In 1642 the great conflict
between Dissenter (Puritans) and Anglicans
came to a satiated zone indicating
a big - political factionalism.