

Coursework Proposal Form

Name	Angus Dunn
Title	Historians have disagreed about whether Oliver Cromwell's actions were justified during his time as commander-in-chief of the New Model Army and Lord Protector, 1649 – 1658. What is your view about whether Oliver Cromwell's actions were justified during his time as commander-in-chief of the New Model Army and Lord Protector, 1649 – 1658
Chosen Work 1	<p>Title: 'Cromwell our Chief of Men', Antonia Fraser (Published 2002, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, Orion Books Ltd)</p> <p>Chapter and page number: Chapter 17 "Grandeur", pages 569 and 570 (note: not the whole chapter)</p> <p>Chapter 18 "Briers and Thorns", pages 606 – 615 (note: not the whole chapter)</p> <p>Summary of Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cromwell had popular support to take over, and those who opposed him did not resist violently. • That Cromwell was civilised and fair leader
Chosen Work 2	<p>Title: 'Monarchy with David Starkey' Series 2, Episode 5 'Oliver Cromwell the King Killer' (Aired 2005, Filmed by Granada Video, Distributed by Channel 4 Television Corporation)</p> <p>Weblink: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdDKO-Klflo</p> <p>Summary of Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cromwell used the backing of the army's leaders and the support he had gained during the English Civil War to take over the country in a coup.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cromwell's regime was a military dictatorship that cloaked itself in democratic ideas to remain stable and in power
Chosen Work 3	<p>Title: 'God's Executioner', Micheal O Siochru (Published 2008, Faber & Faber)</p> <p>Chapter and page number: Chapter 4 "Cromwell at Drogheda and Wexford, pages 77, 82 – 87, 89, 90, 97, 98</p> <p>Summary of Interpretation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cromwell used false pretences to justify the slaughtering of civilians. • Cromwell and his men slaughtered people based on their religion, with the main target being the Irish Catholics.
Supplementary Reading	<p>'Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England', C.H Firth (Published 2018, Lume Books)</p> <p>'Killers of the King', Charles Spencer (Published 2014, Bloomsbury Publishing)</p>

Historians have disagreed about whether Oliver Cromwell's actions were justified during his time as commander-in-chief of the New Model Army and Lord Protector, 1649-1658. What is your view about whether Oliver Cromwell's actions were justified during his time as commander-in-chief of the New Model Army and Lord Protector, 1649 – 1658?

Oliver Cromwell is one of the most important figures in British History, but recently historians have begun portraying him in a different light. For much of history, he was viewed as a cruel tyrant, whose actions could not be legitimately justified and by some modern historians, he still is. Nevertheless, revisionist historians have painted him in a new light and seek to justify many of his actions. For example, Antonia Fraser would argue that Cromwell was justified by the norms of the time and that his actions were vindicated by the popular support of his overthrowing of Parliament. However, David Starkey would disagree with this, instead suggesting that Cromwell only had popular support within the military, who would continue to influence his rule, with Charles Spencer also contrasting Fraser, labelling Cromwell as a regicide, which is why he has been chosen as a supplementary historian to back up Starkey. C.H Firth would agree with Fraser to a certain degree, giving justification to Cromwell's domestic policies, citing many of his changes to the law, education system and giving many of his unpopular social policies a political backing, which is why I will use him to discuss social policy as well as to support Fraser's arguments as a supplementary historian. The final historian being referenced is Micheal O Siochru who focuses on Cromwell's actions in Ireland, especially Drogheda and Wexford, arguing that his actions were despicable and a breach of contemporary military code. This piece of work will consider all the historian's arguments and come to an informed judgement based on them, with standards of the time being considered when scrutinising Cromwell as the application of modern standards would be unsuitable and inappropriate. Within my question there are several key elements, firstly the word 'justified' is used to focus upon the historian views of Cromwell's reasonings behind his policies and actions, as well as this. Secondly, the date within my question is quite specific spanning the period from 1649 to 1658, this is because 1649 is when Cromwell begins to gain fame and power after his invasion of Ireland, with him eventually taking power in 1653 and ultimately holding power until his death in 1658, so the date has been used to focus on Cromwell's more relevant and important actions and policies rather than his actions before 1649 and pre-civil war actions. Finally, to conclude as to whether Cromwell was justified the arguments put forth by the historians about Cromwell's actions and justifications will be scrutinised and compared. This essay will focus on 3 specific areas; political, his reforms to the political system and the running of the country; social, social policies and reforms enacted during his rulership over England such as religious freedom and changes to the legal code ; and finally, his military actions, with the focus being on his actions in the 1649 invasion of Ireland and the justification behind it.

The most important factor of Cromwell's tenure was his political reform and its impact on the British political system. Fraser argues that Cromwell had widespread popular support, meaning he could enact these reforms easily, citing that Cromwell had support across the nation and that the English population approved of Cromwell's initial ascension to powerⁱ. This was not only in England; as a colonel in the New Model Army, Robert Lilburne, sent a letter to Cromwell confirming that it was a similar case in Scotlandⁱⁱ. This shows us that from

both England and Scotland there was a level of support for Cromwell taking power and that he could use this as a justification to overthrow both the Rump Parliament and the Barebones Assembly, which had become unpopular amongst many people. Fraser argues this well, by contrasting the well-found support from these areas with a lack of protest to Cromwell's rulership, with the opposition to Cromwell, mainly the Fifth Monarchists and Baptists protesting but not to an extent where it destabilised the country. As well as this, Fraser offers an alternative to the arguments of many of the pro-monarchists of the time who accused Cromwell of using mismanagement to cause administrations to fail, thus allowing him to seize power from them. Fraser offers the view that whilst Cromwell did not intentionally mismanage the former administrations, and even accuses Cromwell's enemies of lying, but does acknowledge that Cromwell certainly benefitted from these administrations failingⁱⁱⁱ. The failing of the Barebones Assembly and the Rump Parliament were therefore not an event that Cromwell intentionally caused, instead he used them as an opportunity to gain power in the Commonwealth and his subsequent rise to power can be justified by the failure of these.

However, we can flip this on its head and use the view of Starkey against this. An argument put forward by Starkey is that Cromwell only had true support within the army, especially amongst fellow radicals within the army who had also supported the removal of Charles I as King, and his subsequent execution. The impact of the army on popular support is such that the presence of an army may have caused the public (especially those in Scotland) to support Cromwell from fear of repercussions, in a sense, diplomacy by the barrel of a musket. As well as this, Starkey argues that Cromwell's administration was purely a military dictatorship disguised as a democracy^{iv}. This shroud of radical and pseudo-democratic ideas, such as ruling without a monarch and eventually the reinstatement of Parliament, were used to hide the true nature of Cromwell's rulership and if this was true, whilst it can be argued that Cromwell's regime was fairer than Charles I, once you peel away the perceived radical democracy you find an administration that bears a striking resemblance to Charles I's rulership in all but title. Furthermore, Starkey also points out that the role of Lord Protector, bestowed on Cromwell in 1653 amid concerns he was losing popular support, was in all but name, the role of a King, with some added extras. How Cromwell would have justified this was questionable; there were calls in the Commonwealth to make him the King, but he would be subservient to Parliament if he accepted the position. Cromwell used this as a justification to claim near dictatorial powers coming from a demand to make him the King which he then capitalised on to do more than a King, but this was not justified as there were rules that limited the King's power, for example, a monarch had to seek Parliament's consent before passing bills or tax legislature. Cromwell could not justify using popular support for his ascension to Lord Protector, in late 1653, as more people wanted him to become King as this was a role that they understood the limits of. When paired with Spencer's view, Starkey's argument is magnified, with Spencer accusing Cromwell of having a brutal single-mindedness that in turn harmed his popularity. Following his initial rise to power, many of his fellow regicides withdrew support due to the promotion of only one view (his view), such that he played directly into the hands of their enemies, and whilst it's odd to talk about popular support when we perceive not only Cromwell, but rulers of the time as tyrannical monarchs who ruled with little check in place, it is important to mention that without popular support Cromwell could not be fully justified in many of his actions. For example, from the start of his reign, he had boasted about support for his takeover and reports from across the country after his first ascension to power showed that he had some popular support. Overall

Cromwell's actions around his ascension to the position of Lord Protector and his regime are unjustified when using the argument of popular support due to the difference in nature between the role of King and Lord Protector.

Fraser would however argue that Cromwell was justified due to his rule being purely temporary to start with, as the Council of State was set up to rule the country until it was deemed that a Parliament could be called to deal with the running of the nation^v. Cromwell only set up this Council so they could get important legislation passed and he did stay true to this promise when he recalled Parliament in 1653, nevertheless, he still acted as the overseer of Parliament, but mostly allowed the Parliament to debate for itself, this justifies the initial Council of State as it purely acted as a provisional government as a state without a government would have caused more internal problems. This Council of State is also justified due to its composition, whilst Fraser does acknowledge that the Council was made up of solid Cromwell supporters^{vi} such as soldiers and divine men, it also comprised former royalists and members of its predecessor, the Barebones Assembly. This is a far more representative body than many historians would argue and Fraser notices that whilst these men were still supporters of Cromwell, their other interests made them more diverse, such as Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper who had previously supported Charles I, but in the face of national interest supported the de facto government.

However, Starkey would argue that Cromwell's rulership did not follow these guidelines. A point that Starkey brings forward, is the similarities between Cromwell and the man he helped to execute, Charles I^{vii}. Whilst many historians say that without Cromwell taking absolute power the country would have been ruined due to the lack of a monarch, and this is not a point that Starkey disagrees with, but by acting in a similar manner to Charles I it removes many of the democratic ideas that Cromwell had implemented to conceal his true power and put-on full display his grip over the country. It also exposed the power that the military had over the state as after dissolving Parliament, Cromwell left the running of the regions to 11 Military Governors, lasting between 1655 and 1657 who were also high standing men within the military^{viii}. Spencer would agree with this, also citing that this policy led to the appointment of corrupt generals having regional power.

Overall, Cromwell's political reforms were mostly justified due to his initial popular support and the arguments against him were largely fabrications with the intent to delegitimise him. However, we must also recognise that Cromwell's alleged original desire, according to Fraser, is far from what Starkey and Spencer describe as the eventual rule of Cromwell.

During Cromwell's rulership, it was not only the political system that changed drastically, but also the social law and standards of Britain. Fraser shows Cromwell's social policy well and when paired with Firth, it gives a new perspective on Cromwell with elements of religious freedom and many of the social policies being politically motivated instead of the perceived religious motivation. To start with, if we consider a policy that Firth cites which is the Reformation of Manners^{ix} which can be interpreted as Cromwell trying to force Puritanical beliefs throughout the country to convert more people to Puritanism. However, elements of the Reformation have different motivations and can justify the act, for example the ban on duelling^x that put a stop to what was seen as legal murder by many, with it being seen by

Cromwell and other Puritans as immoral and unjust. Another one of these ordinances put a ban on horse racing; Cromwell justified this by pointing out that Fifth Monarchists were using races to plot schemes against him and his regime, as well as causing dissent^{xi}. Firth uses this idea of royalist dissent to justify more of Cromwell's policies, for example, whilst he did limit Anglican worship it was only when plots against the government were discovered that Cromwell would order soldiers to root out practising Anglicans, which is what many royalists followed, and it was believed that these meetings of worship were being used to plot against the Protector and bring back the monarchy. This idea of a form of religious freedom whereby the government only acted against a religion when it was found that there were attempts to destabilise the Commonwealth are more justified than difference in religion and show us that Cromwell and his administration were by and the large the most religiously free rulership up to that time in British History. Another example of Cromwell only acting when a group acted in a way that would destabilise the nation was the Quakers; whilst they were considered to be blasphemous, the primary justification behind their imprisonment and persecution was their attacks against the church^{xii}, which at the time was considered a serious offence due to the prevalence of religion in people's lives and beliefs. Another social reform that Cromwell enacted was the reformation of the law and legal procedure, Fraser paints this clearly by showing how Cromwell made changes to the corrupt law system that allowed for a freer and fairer legal code. These reforms, primarily driven by Puritanism-in-practice, have been praised by many revisionist historians to be ahead of their time and included reducing the crimes punishable by death from hundreds to only two, those being treason and murder. This change to the law was hugely important as Cromwell was able to use it to justify to those who opposed him that he was benefitting the country as he was making much needed reform to the ancient legal code. A code that would return once the monarchy had been restored.

However, Starkey would disagree that Cromwell's social policies were justified and would likewise disagree with Firth that religious freedom had truly been reached. Starkey presents a strong case for Cromwell's social policies not only being unjustified but for being hypocritical too. An important element of Cromwell's rise to power was the group of radicals in the army who supported him, however, in the same army there was also a group that followed Presbyterianism, who up until Cromwell stormed Parliament to take control, had themselves control over the running of the nation. The Presbyterians wanted to force their beliefs upon the nation, and this was one of the main points of scrutiny for Cromwell, as he argued at the time that the state should have no right to interfere in the church. However, it can be argued that Cromwell himself ended up imposing a religion upon the nation through his social reform by banning many British past times in line with Puritanical beliefs. To start with, Starkey opposes an argument put forward by Firth that there was religious freedom for the wider Protestant faiths, and supports this by showing that Presbyterianism, which was largely based on Protestantism, was one of the many faiths whose followers were persecuted during Cromwell's regime. So, this idea of religious tolerance of other Protestant faiths is clearly not justified, as it only applied to a select group of Protestant faiths. Additionally, Cromwell's own image of himself as a Religious Fanatic takes away justifications for reforming the law. Cromwell saw himself as the reincarnation of the biblical figure, Gideon, who was a military leader, judge, and prophet, this heavily negates many of Cromwell's changes to the law as it is again trying to justify them on religious grounds which can be argued was a similar justification to what the Presbyterians would have attempted to use if they had risen to power instead of Cromwell. This hypocrisy makes many of Cromwell's social policies questionable,

especially those concerning religious freedom and the outlawing of many British past times to suit his more Puritanical beliefs. Whilst not fully agreeing with Starkey that it was for moral and religious reasons, Spencer suggests that Cromwell outlawed certain past times (such as a crackdown on Bear Baiting in 1656) on the grounds of profit as more likely motivating factor^{xiii}. However, Spencer does not go into any more detail about this, so it leaves the argument of whether Cromwell was unjustified in removing traditional British past times of the time, as without any proper evidence or a further point of argument, it is hard to justify Spencer's point.

However, Firth states that Cromwell did want to enact further religious freedom to groups such as the Catholics and the Jews, but the hostile opinion to these groups in England held these reforms back. This could justify the lack of recognition by the government of these religions and their beliefs, as Cromwell largely wanted to maintain the stability of the nation. Firth also praises Cromwell in a way that most other historians do not, arguing that Cromwell was far more liberal minded than others perceived him to be^{xiv}. In fact, one of the first points that Firth makes in the chapter is to disagree with another historian^{xv} who portrays Cromwell as military man with no skills within politics. Firth corrects this as he mentions that the reason that many of Cromwell's social policies did not have an impact is that almost all his ordinances were removed upon the restoration of the monarchy who saw Cromwell's rulership as illegitimate and viewed him as a traitor, thus they had to remove his policies to re-establish order.

Overall, Cromwell's social policies were mostly justified if we take Firth's argument of Cromwell's social policies not being on a religious basis, but instead a political one to limit the influence of royalists through, for instance, the closure of racecourses and the outlawing of Anglicanism. However, we also cannot cast aside Starkey's argument as it shows that Cromwell's perceived religious freedom was hypocritical and, in many ways, incorrect as the promise of freedom of worship for all Protestant faiths was not met as he did not give fair representation to the Presbyterians without a proper justification as to why.

One event that cannot be skipped over when writing about Cromwell are his actions in the Invasion of Ireland, specifically those of The Storming of Drogheda and Wexford, which occurred in 1649. Cromwell's justification for the harsh treatment of Irish Catholics during the affair was primarily on religious grounds,^{xvi} namely that the Irish Catholics had mistreated Protestants in the region. Siochru argues heavily against this as there is no evidence to suggest that the Irish Catholics ever controlled the settlement^{xvii} or massacred protestants there, meaning that Cromwell's reasoning for the storming and subsequent killings is unjustified. Furthermore, Siochru highlights that not only was the religious argument behind the massacres flawed, but that in ordering, and in the case of Drogheda participating in, these massacres that Cromwell was breaching contemporary military code^{xviii}. Accounts of what occurred at Drogheda are hard to come across, however Siochru cites one that shows the brutal acts that the New Model Army committed under Cromwell. This account talks of civilians targeted despite the claims made by many that Parliamentarians only targeted those who took up arms against them and that they were only spared once an officer recognised the people as protestants ordering his troops to halt fire. This shows that Drogheda was based on the senseless killing of the Irish Catholics instead of the wider population of the settlement, however it is likely that protestants got caught up in the affair and subsequently lost their

lives because of it. Wexford was a similar affair and whilst Cromwell did not directly engage in the killings at Wexford, he oversaw them and did nothing to intervene in the deaths of thousands. Siochru mentions a petition from the locals and a clerical account to show the horrors of Wexford^{xix}. The storming of Wexford had the same justification as that of Drogheda, with Cromwell again trying to attribute it to the Irish Catholic's treatment of protestants in the area. There is key evidence against this claim that comes from Cromwell's own beliefs as he considered all non-protestant faiths as immoral and believed that as punishment for these religious differences, he was justified in ordering and/or taking part in the persecution and slaughter of innocent Catholics as a psychological tactic. It can be argued then that Cromwell's true justification for slaughtering Catholics and not taking soldiers as ransom was a method of psychological warfare where troops would find out about the heinous acts and would not want to face the same fate as those who resisted at Drogheda and Wexford.

Both stormings had huge impacts on the Irish population; in Drogheda, the entire garrison is said to have been put to the sword by Cromwell and his men, with many civilians perishing as well^{xx}. At Wexford, accounts of what occurred describe the soldiers' unrestricted bloodlust. Whilst the numbers slaughtered because of Cromwell's campaign is disputed, there is no doubt that it was a cold-blooded act of murder and that Cromwell was not justified to order this slaughter as Siochru clearly sets out and pegs the belief that these massacres only served to tarnish Cromwell's reputation with the Irish Catholics.

In conclusion, this piece of work shows that Cromwell's actions during his time in office were broadly justified, regarding both his political and social reforms. However, his actions in Ireland cannot be justified to the same level. From the historian's arguments, which are convincing, and each offer a different perspective on Cromwell, it can be concluded that Cromwell was justified in both his political and social policy and reforms, whereas in Ireland, this is not the case. Despite this, when combining all three criteria it can be said that Oliver Cromwell's actions were justified during his time as the Commander-in-Chief of the New Model Army and as Lord Protector in the years 1649 – 1658. Politically, whilst Starkey does make the point that during Cromwell's time in office, the army gained significant power and to a certain degree that Cromwell's rule was in reality military rule with Cromwell simply as a puppet for their interests, the arguments that Fraser puts forward outweigh Starkey's, with Fraser showing that Cromwell did have support outside of the military and that many of the points made against Cromwell were simply not true and were used at the time in an attempt to discredit him and destabilise his rulership. Socially, whilst Starkey does, with the support of Spencer, put forward a convincing argument for Cromwell being hypocritical by imposing social policies on the nation with his Puritanical beliefs being the justification, the counterpoints that Fraser, with the aid of Firth, advance show that, Cromwell's social policies were widely justified as they were less about religion, and more about trying to limit Monarchist sympathies. As well as, both Fraser and Firth herald Cromwell as a great social reformer in areas such as law, education, and religion. However, Cromwell's actions in Ireland cannot be justified at all; Siochru puts forward a convincing argument that shows that even though Cromwell was acting within the law of the time, his actions were a clear breach of contemporary military code. He also shows that Cromwell's justification for the treatment of the Irish Catholics was heavily flawed.

Word Count: 3,815

ⁱ 'For the accession of Oliver Cromwell to supreme power was, on the whole, accepted with philosophy and even a certain degree of favourable anticipation by the English People' Antonia Fraser p569

ⁱⁱ 'he found nothing in Scotland but 'union... and a resolution to stand with your lordship in the management of those weighty affairs that providence has cast upon you'' Antonia Fraser p569

ⁱⁱⁱ 'Although Cromwell's enemies were certainly lying when they accused him of managing this second inefficient body deliberately in order to bring odium upon parliaments for the sake of his own ambitions, it is true that he enjoyed the benefits of their failures' Antonia Fraser p570

^{iv} 'Cromwell was a reluctant revolutionary and was eager to cloak his military dictatorship in decent constitutional garb, as was the army and the new council of officers.' David Starkey

^v 'for until a Parliament should be summoned both legislative and executive function were to be performed by Protector and Council of State, without further check upon them' Antonia Fraser p606

^{vi} 'These important associates themselves, consisted very much of name already known, for one reason or another as solid Cromwell supporters' Antonia Fraser p606

^{vii} "Cromwell Responded by behaving also like Charles I, first denouncing Parliament and then dissolving it." David Starkey

^{viii} "But in trying to rule without a Parliament Cromwell was more than ever thrown into the arms of the army and was obliged as far as possible to satisfy its demands. Cromwell's most dramatic concession to the army came in 1655 with his agreement to the appointment of 11 major general as military governors". David Starkey

^{ix} 'The Reformation of Manners was an object in which the Protector obtained more support from Parliament. All puritans were eager for it.' C.H Firth p227

^x 'One declared duelling unpleasing to God, unbecoming Christians and contrary to all good order and government' C.H Firth p227

^{xi} A fourth suppressed horse-racing for six months, not because of its accompaniments, but because the Cavaliers made use of race meetings to carry on their pernicious designs C.H Firth p227

^{xii} 'Under the Commonwealth, the Quakers were persecuted and imprisoned, not simply because their opinions were regarded as blasphemous, but because they were held dangerous to public peace. Their attacks on the clergy and their misconduct and brawling in churches gave colour to these accusations. Under the Protectorate, this persecution continued, till it was mitigated by the intervention of the Protector and his Council' C.H Firth p235

^{xiii} 'Their traditional enjoyment had been removed in the name of morality; but, it was strongly suspected, the true motive had been profit' Charles Spencer p89

^{xiv} 'Cromwell's was the most tolerant government which had existed in England since the Reformation, In practice, he was more lenient than the laws, and more liberal-minded than most of his advisers. The drawback was that even the more limited amount of religious freedom which the laws guaranteed seemed too much to the great majority of the nation' C.H Firth p238

^{xv} 'Hallam in a disparaging comparison between Cromwell and Napoleon, concludes by saying that Cromwell, unlike Napoleon, "never showed any signs of a legislative mind, or any to fix his renown on that noblest basis, the amelioration of social institutions." In reality, nothing could be farther from the truth, and if Cromwell's reforming zeal had left no trace on the statute book the reason is that all the laws passed during the Protectorate were annulled at the Restoration.' C.H Firth p225

^{xvi} 'He claimed that the killings at Drogheda constituted the righteous judgement of God upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood' Micheal O Siochru p84

^{xvii} 'The Catholic Irish, however, never controlled Drogheda during the 1640s as the town remained in either parliamentary or royalist hands until Cromwell's arrival' Micheal O Siochru p84

^{xviii} 'Such a calculated act of cold-blooded murder, not taken in the heat of action, was not only highly dishonourable but also a clear breach of contemporary military code' Micheal O Siochru p87

^{xix} 'According to a petition of the surviving inhabitants, all the men, women and children of the town to a very few were killed during the assault, while a clerical account described how the blood lust of soldiers flooded the streets and houses' Micheal O Siochru p97

^{xx} 'In addition to the 3,000 military casualties, the list included the phrase and many inhabitants' Micheal O Siochru p90

Bibliography

Martyn Bennet, (2018), *Oliver Cromwell: the secret of his military genius*, BBC History Magazine, London: BBC <https://www.historyextra.com/period/stuart/oliver-cromwell-the-secret-of-his-military-genius/> [accessed 3 November 2020]

C.H Firth, (2018, originally published 1900), *Oliver Cromwell and the rule of the Puritans in England*, 2nd Edition, London: Lume Books (Supplementary Historian)

Antonia Fraser, (2008, originally published 1973), *Cromwell our Chief of Man*, 2nd Edition, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, Orion Publishing Group. (Main Historian)

Noel M.Griffin (2008), *How many died during Cromwell's Campaign?* , History of Ireland Magazine Issue 6, Dublin: Wordwell Books, <https://www.historyireland.com/cromwell/how-many-died-during-cromwells-campaign/> [accessed 14 October 2020]

Paul Lay, (2020), *Providence Lost: The Rise and Fall of Cromwell's Protectorate* , 1st Edition, London: Apollo Books, Head of Zeus Ltd

John Morill, (2010), *Putting Words into Cromwell's Mouth*, BBC History Magazine, London: BBC <https://www.historyextra.com/period/stuart/putting-words-into-cromwells-mouth/> [accessed 27 October 2020]

John Morill (2014), *Oliver Cromwell: Hero or Villain?*, BBC History Magazine 'The Stuarts' bookazine, BBC: London <https://www.historyextra.com/period/stuart/oliver-cromwell-hero-or-villain/> [accessed 14 November 2020]

Diane Purkiss, (2007), *The English Civil War a People's War*, 1st Edition, London: Harper Perennial

Tom Reilly, (2014), *Cromwell was Framed: Ireland 1649*, 1st Edition, Winchester: Chronos Books

Micheál Ó Siochrú, (2008), *God's Executioner*, 1st Edition, London: Faber and Faber (Main Historian)

Charles Spencer, (2014), *Killers of the King: The men who dared to execute Charles I*, 1st Edition, London: Bloomsbury Publishing (Supplementary Historian)

David Starkey, (2005), *Monarchy Series 2 Episode 5 Oliver Cromwell the King Killer*, Granada Video and Channel 4 Television Corporation, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdDKO-Klflo> [accessed 28 October 2020] (Main Historian)

Mark Stoyle, (2020), *Did Oliver Cromwell ban Christmas? The Puritan assault on Christmas during the 1640s and 1650s*, BBC History Magazine, London: BBC, <https://www.historyextra.com/period/stuart/no-christmas-under-cromwell-the-puritan-assault-on-christmas-during-the-1640s-and-1650s/> [accessed 2 December 2020]

Resource record

Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in History
Centre name: Chipping Campden School Academy
Candidate name: Angus Dunn

Resources used. The three works chosen for the assignment must be asterisked.	Page/web reference	Student comments	Student date(s) when accessed	Teacher initials and date resource record checked
Charles Spencer, Chapter 4, "A New Monarchy", Killers of the King (Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014)	Pg 87, 89 and 91	Chapter 4, "A New Monarchy" is about how Cromwell took power from parliament and became the Lord Protector along with his consolidation of power across the commonwealth. This will be a supplementary historian to back up the views of my main historian arguing that Cromwell was unjustified in his actions.	08/10/20	16/10/20 AK
*Antonia Fraser, Cromwell our Chief of Men Chapter 17 "Grandeur", Chapter 18, "Briers and Thorns" (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, Orion	Chapter 17: "Grandeur" Pg 569 – 570 (not the whole Chapter) Chapter 18: "Briers and Thorns" Pg 606 – 615 (not the whole Chapter)	Chapter 17: This chapter talks about Cromwell's initial rise to power, with the two pages I have chosen going into detail about the support Cromwell had to take over the running of the country, as	16/10/20	19/10/20 AK

Publishing Group, 2008)		<p>well as the opposition that he faced from some groups.</p> <p>Chapter 18: This argument used by Fraser to show Cromwell as a more civilised and fairer leader are shown well, arguments about the treatment of Catholics, Anglicans and Royalists show Cromwell as a fairer leader, whilst also casting doubt as to whether this was based on necessity</p> <p>It also uses compares the Barebones Parliament (the previous government before the protectorate) and how it was less democratic and less representative than the new council of state, but it also shows restraint in that it acknowledges the weaknesses of the Council of State</p>		
-------------------------	--	---	--	--

		This will be one of my main historians, with Fraser supporting Cromwell, but also showing that he was flawed		
*Monarchy with David Starkey, Series 2 Episode 5 'Oliver Cromwell the King Killer', first aired 10 th October 2005 (produced by Granada Video, distributed by Channel 4 Television Corporation)	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fdDKO-Klflo 00:00 – 34:46	This documentary is part of a series presented by David Starkey on the different British Monarchs, Cromwell is included in this series due to him being essentially a monarch. It talks about his involvement in the Civil Wars as well as his period in power as Lord Protector, with him acting unchecked and with support mainly within the military that appeared to be democratic and fair This will be one of my main historians due to it going into great detail about Cromwell during this period as well as showing the bad side of his rulership	28/10/20	03/11/20 AK
C.H Firth, Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England	Pg 225 – 227, 229, 230, 232 – 235, 237 - 239	This chapter talks about Cromwell's domestic policy during his time as Lord Protector	29/10/20	03/11/20 AK

<p>Chapter 17 “Cromwell’s Domestic policy, 1654 – 1658” First Published in the UK by Putnam’s Sons. 1900 Edition I’m using was published in 2018 by Lume Books</p>		<p>It is praising of him for his legislative mind and the ordinances he passed that reformed a wide range of systems. It also justifies some of his more unpopular policies by giving them a political justification</p> <p>This will be a supplementary historian as it pairs well with “Cromwell Our Chief of Men” with it expanding upon many of the policies that they both mention</p>		
<p>*Micheal O Siochru, God’s Executioner, Chapter 4 “Cromwell at Drogheda and Wexford” (Faber and Faber, 2009)</p>	<p>Pg 77, 82 – 87, 89, 90, 97, 98</p>	<p>This will be one of my main historians, arguing against Cromwell, due to his action in Ireland showing him as a cruel, murderous, tyrant during his time as commander in chief of the Army in Ireland.</p> <p>Cromwell’s time in Ireland can be shown by two key events that occurred the Storming of</p>	<p>31/10/20</p>	<p>03/11/20 AK</p>

		<p>Drogheda and the Storming of Wexford</p> <p>Both of these were bloody affairs with the numbers of casualties debated to this day, but from the accounts put forward in this book you can tell that it wasn't just military casualties and that Cromwell's forces murdered civilians, with Cromwell personally overseeing this at Drogheda</p> <p>This is mainly due to a retaliation against Irish Catholics who Cromwell justified attacks against by using the killing of Protestant settlers in 1641-42 as a justification for the killings</p>		
Paul Lay, Providence Lost: The Rise and Fall of Cromwell's Protectorate, Chapter 14 "Cromwell and the Crown"	Pg 212 - 219	Whilst this book provides excellent context on the Protectorate and its rise and subsequent fall, it doesn't offer a	05/11/20	17/11/20 AK

(Apollo Books, Head of Zeus Ltd, 2020)		<p>clear line of argument.</p> <p>It also talks very little about what my question is focused on, Cromwell's actions, more just focusing on the events of the time. As well as this it is less focussed on solely Cromwell, and broadens out the scope to talk about other figures of the time</p> <p>Whilst I would have liked to use this piece as a supplementary historian, the points above mean that it would not be useful for me to use</p>		
Tom Reilly, Cromwell Was Framed: Ireland 1649 Chapter 3 "Chapter Three"(Chronos Books, 2014)	Chapter Three: Pg 99, Pg 160 – 172, Pg 188 – 192	Reilly offers a different perspective to most historians about Cromwell's actions in Ireland, attempting to justify them by analysing primary sources that show many of the claims were fraudulent about Drogheda and that many of them	12/11/20	23/11/20 AK

		<p>contradicting each other with different claims of the numbers of casualties. He uses this to criticise many historians who hold the opinion that Cromwell's actions in Ireland were unjustified.</p> <p>Whilst I could use this as a supplementary to criticise Siochru's argument, as to an extent it would be useful for that, from the perspective of a historical text it lacks a clear line of argument as it is a piece in response to feedback of Reilly's previous work on Cromwell "Cromwell – An Honourable Enemy: The Untold Story of the Cromwellian Invasion of Ireland", which whilst having some notable positive reviews is discredited by many scholars primarily due to the long standing opinion of Cromwell that</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		many in Ireland have held		
--	--	------------------------------	--	--