



1688

THE FIRST MODERN
REVOLUTION

STEVE PINCUS

1688

THE LEWIS WALPOLE SERIES IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY CULTURE AND HISTORY

The Lewis Walpole Series, published by Yale University Press with the aid of the Annie Burr Lewis Fund, is dedicated to the culture and history of the long eighteenth century (from the Glorious Revolution to the accession of Queen Victoria). It welcomes work in a variety of fields, including literature and history, the visual arts, political philosophy, music, legal history, and the history of science. In addition to original scholarly work, the series publishes new editions and translations of writing from the period, as well as reprints of major books that are currently unavailable. Though the majority of books in the series will probably concentrate on Great Britain and the Continent, the range of our geographical interests is as wide as Horace Walpole's.

1688

*THE FIRST MODERN
REVOLUTION*

STEVE PINCUS

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS NEW HAVEN & LONDON

Disclaimer: Some images in the printed version of this book
are not available for inclusion in the eBook.

Published with the assistance of the Frederick W. Hilles Publication Fund of Yale University;
the Kingsley Trust Association Publication Fund established by the Scroll and Key Society of Yale College;
and the Annie Burr Lewis Fund.

Copyright © 2009 by Yale University.

All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including illustrations, in any form
(beyond that copying permitted by Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except
by reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publishers.

Designed by James J. Johnson and set in Adobe Garamond type by Duke & Company,
Devon, Pennsylvania.

Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Pincus, Steven C. A.

1688 : the first modern revolution / Steve Pincus.

p. cm. — (The Lewis Walpole series in eighteenth-century culture and history)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-300-11547-5

1. Great Britain—History—Revolution of 1688. 2. Great Britain—History—Revolution of 1688—
Historiography. 3. Great Britain—History—Revolution of 1688—Social aspects. I. Title.

DA452.P53 2009

941.06'7—dc22

2009004607

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

List of Illustrations	vii
Acknowledgments	xi

PART I. INTRODUCTORY

Introduction	3
CHAPTER ONE. The Unmaking of a Revolution	II
CHAPTER TWO. Rethinking Revolutions	30

PART II. PREREVOLUTIONARY ENGLAND

CHAPTER THREE. Going Dutch: English Society in 1685	49
CHAPTER FOUR. English Politics at the Accession of James II	91
CHAPTER FIVE. The Ideology of Catholic Modernity	118
CHAPTER SIX. The Practice of Catholic Modernity	143
CHAPTER SEVEN. Resistance to Catholic Modernity	179

PART III. REVOLUTION

CHAPTER EIGHT. Popular Revolution	221
CHAPTER NINE. Violent Revolution	254
CHAPTER TEN. Divisive Revolution	278

PART IV. REVOLUTIONARY TRANSFORMATION

CHAPTER ELEVEN. Revolution in Foreign Policy	305
CHAPTER TWELVE. Revolution in Political Economy	366
CHAPTER THIRTEEN. Revolution in the Church	400

PART V. CONCLUSION

CHAPTER FOURTEEN. Assassination, Association, and the Consolidation of Revolution	437
CHAPTER FIFTEEN. Conclusion: The First Modern Revolution	474
Abbreviations	487
Notes	489
Manuscripts Consulted	619
Index	631

Illustrations

- 2 *County Map of England*. Drawn by Stacey Maples, Yale University Library.
- 11 *Centenary of the Revolution*, 1788. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 22 *Banner Used at the Centenary Celebrations of the Revolution at Chesterfield in Derbyshire*, 1788. Chesterfield Borough Council.
- 30 *Centenary of the Revolution*, 1788. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 49 *British Colonization*, by John Roettier, 1670. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 53 Playing cards from *All the Bubbles*, c. 1720. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 61 *The Thames by Westminster Stairs*, by Claude de Jongh, 1631 or 1637. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection. *The Thames from the Terrace of Somerset House, Looking toward St. Paul's*, by Canaletto, c. 1750. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection.
- 67 Playing cards from *All the Bubbles*, c. 1720. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 73 *Amicable Society Instituted*, 1696. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 76 *Figures in a Tavern or Coffeehouse*, attributed to Joseph Highmore, 1720s. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection.
- 80 *The Coffeehouse Mob*, from Edward Ward, *Vulgus Britannicus; or, The British Hubridas*, 1710. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 83 *Panoramic View of the City of London and Stepney*, by William Morgan, 1682. Guildhall Library, City of London.
- 85 *The Island of Barbados*, by Isaac Sailmaker, c. 1694. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection.
- 91 *James, Duke of Monmouth, and Archibald, Earl of Argyle; Beheaded*, by R. Arondeaux, 1685. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 105 *James, Duke of Monmouth and Buccleuch*, by William Baillie, c. 1774. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection.

- 106 Playing card: "The Late D. of M. Entering Lime with 1500 Men." Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 109 Playing card: "The Godly Maids of Taunton Presenting Their Colours upon Their Knees to the D. of M." Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 115 Playing cards: "Bonfires Made the 26 of July att Night Being the Thanksgiving for the Victory 1685" and "Severall of the Rebels Hang'd upon a Tree." Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 118 *James II and Queen Mary; Accession and Coronation*, by George Bower, 1685. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 127 *The Scientifk Three Horned Doctor, Father Peters, a Great Labourer, in Works of Darkness / Het Stookhuys van Pater Peters, en der Jesuiten in Engeland*, 1689. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 130 Playing card: "The Earle of Castlemain Sent Embassador to the Pope." By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 143 *The Religious State of England*, attributed to Jan Smeltzing, 1688. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 147 *Requisition of Guestbeds for the British Army in 1686*. Drawn by Stacey Maples, Yale University Library.
- 148 *The Camp on Hounslow-Heath*, 1686. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 158 Playing card: "Comishoners Sent into the Cuntry to Perswade the People to Choose Such Men as Shall Take of the Penl. Laws." By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 161 *Corporations Remodeled between 1685 and 1688*. Drawn by Stacey Maples, Yale University Library.
- 165 Playing cards: "A Jesuit Preaching against Our Bible" and "A Preist Selling of Relicks by Auction." By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 169 Playing card: "A New Comishond Cort for to Inquier into the Ecclesiasticall Affairs." By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 177 *Qualis Vir Talis Oratio*, by Romeyn de Hooghe, 1688. Courtesy of the Lewis Walpole Library, Yale University.
- 179 *Invitation to William and Mary of Orange*, 1688. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 187 *The Election in the Guildhall*, by Egbert Van Heemskerck, c. 1687 Copyright Museum of Oxford.
- 190 Playing card: "Magdalens Coledg Seized and the Felows of the Coledg Routed for Keeping to the Laws of the Coledg." By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 192 *The Seven Bishops with Portrait Medallions*, by Simon Gribelin, 1688. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 194 Playing card: "About 200 Ministers Suspended in the Countey of Duram for not

- Reading the Kings Declaration.” By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 214 From *Engelants Schouwtoneel*, by Romeyn de Hooghe, 1692. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 221 *Landing of William of Orange at Torbay*, by Jan Luder, 1688. The Trustees of the British Museum
- 229 Playing card: “Sum of the Nobility of England Are Sending Their Memorialls of Their Distresses to the Prince of Oring.” By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 236 Playing card: “The Ould Oxford Regiment of Horse with 2 More First Left the King and Went to the Prince.” By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 242 *Het lande van Syn Hoogh in Engelant*, by Bastiaen Stoopendaal, 1689. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 245 *William’s Progress to London*, c. 1689. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 249 Playing cards: “Libells Thrown about the Citty Concerning a Massacre That Was to Be Made by the Papists.” Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. “Cry the Prince of Orange’s Third Declaration.” By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 250 *Receptie van S.K.H. den H. Prince van Orange ap zyn intrede tot London*, by Romeyn de Hooghe, 1689. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 251 Playing cards: “Singing of Lilly Bul-lero” and “The Prince of Orange Coming to St. Jameses Is Received with Great Joy.” By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 254 *Roman Catholic Chapels Destroyed*, 1689. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 255 Playing cards: “A Fight at Reding Wherin the Irish Souldiers Suffred Most the People Firing out at Window’s on Them” and “The Fight at Redding.” By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 258 Playing cards: “Lime Street Chapple Pulling Down and Burnt” and “Burning the Popish Chapple in Lincolns Inn Fields.” By kind permission of the Worshipful Company of Makers of Playing Cards.
- 263 *The Lord Chancellor Taken Disguis’d in Wapping*, 1688. Guildhall Library, City of London.
- 266 *The Equestrian Statue of James II in Newcastle*. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 276 From *Engelants Schouwtoneel*, by Romeyn de Hooghe, 1692. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
- 278 *Throne of England Declared Vacant*, by Jan Smeltzing, 1689. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 305 *Louis XIV and William III Contrasted*, by F. D. Winter, 1691. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 310 *The Coffee-house Politicians*, 1733. The Trustees of the British Museum.

- 317 *Wie Boren Zynen Staet*, by Romeyn de Hooghe, 1688. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 341 *France, Her Allies and Enemies*. Drawn by Stacey Maples, Yale University Library.
- 346 *Innocent XI Blessing William III (?)*, attributed to Pieter van der Muelen, c. 1690s. Reproduction by kind permission of the Northern Ireland Assembly.
- 366 *Louis XIV: Indian Trade Molested*, by Thomas Bernard, 1695. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 379 *English Dominions in 1688*. Drawn by Stacey Maples, Yale University Library.
- 391 *Premier Map of London and Suburbs: The Bank of England in the Poultry*, 1724. Yale Center for British Art, Paul Mellon Collection.
- 400 *Toleration Act*, 1689. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 437 *William III: National Association*, 1696. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 440 *The Triumphs of Providence over Hell, France & Rome, in Defeating & Discovering of the Late Hellish and Barbarous Plott, for Assassinating His Royall Majesty King William the III*, 1696. The Trustees of the British Museum.
- 474 *William and Mary: Coronation*, by R. Arondeaux, 1689. The Trustees of the British Museum.

Acknowledgments

Like the Revolution of 1688–89 itself, this book has been long in the making. Over the decade that I worked on this book I have amassed a number of debts, most of which can never be repaid.

I began the project with modest aims. I hoped to write an interpretative essay suggesting that the international dimension of the Revolution of 1688–89 was underappreciated. A number of conversations I had when a postdoctoral fellow in Harvard's Society of Fellows convinced me there was something more to be done. Bernard Bailyn was one of the first to encourage me to think bigger. Wallace MacCaffrey, my dissertation supervisor, was as always unflaggingly supportive and helpful. Blair Worden not only urged me on but asked some tough questions along the way. After a lunch at Churchill College, Mark Goldie suggested that I look further into the commercial and mercantile contexts of the 1680s. When Tim Harris and I learned that we were writing parallel books, we had numerous discussions to make sure that we would not duplicate our efforts.

Many of the ideas developed in this book bear the mark of my time at the University of Chicago. My colleagues there, not only in the history department, but in sociology, political science, and English, all asked good questions and helped think of new paths by which I could find answers. Wilder House, the Chicago Humanities Center and the Early Modern Workshop, offered stimulating cross-disciplinary environments in which to discuss, argue about, and test ideas. Some friends and colleagues were subjected to an unusually large number of coffees with me in the Classics Café and elsewhere. They deserve special thanks. Bill Novak always had an open door and an encouraging word. Andy Abbot had excellent advice and was willing to offer an informed and critical ear. Richard Strier, despite wishing fervently that I worked on the late Elizabethan or Jacobean periods, asked important questions and offered provocative suggestions. Claudio Lomnitz was a willing tennis partner and an excellent reader of my work. Lynn Sanders not only playfully discussed ideas and concepts but bravely killed arachnids at key moments. Cornell Fleischer, Jules Kirshner, and Tamar Herzog helped create a vibrant early modernist community.

In my last few years at Chicago, the Nicholson Center for British Studies created a new context to think about my project. Janel Mueller played an instrumental role not only in creating the center but as a friend and colleague as well. Discussions on the Board with Dipesh Chakrabarty, Jacob Levy, Josh Scodel, Andy Abbot, Janel, and others could not but suggest new kinds of questions. Eva Wilhelm was not only a terrific administrator but an intellectual force and a dear friend as well.

Since coming to Yale I have benefited from discussions with and suggestions from a wide variety of colleagues, including Keith Wrightson, Stuart Schwartz, Julia Adams, Phil Gorski, David Underdown, Francesca Trivellato, David Quint, Annabel Patterson, Karuna Mantena, Jim Whitman, and Bryan Garsten. The participants in the *Transitions to Modernity*, *British Historical Studies*, and *Comparative Sociology* colloquia all provided me with friendly and critical audiences.

This project is a necessarily transatlantic one. Many scholars and friends in the United Kingdom and on the Continent have provided support, the occasional bed, and the more frequent patient ear during the long gestation of this project. Adam and Carolyn Fox have often housed me and provided me with much-needed good food and great cheer. Adam has more often than he would care to remember discussed English political history with me and raised important questions. Mark Knights has shared ideas and his passion for a similar terrain. Blair Worden has always been willing to lend a critical eye and suggest useful resources. Jean-Fredric Schaub invited me to spend time at the EHESS and provided an opportunity to present my ideas before a French audience.

I owe a great debt to my students, graduate and undergraduate, at both Chicago and Yale. Not only have I subjected them to my crazy ideas—to which they have had the good taste to listen patiently with only a few smirks and incredulous tosses of the head—but, more important, they helped to shape them in seminars, over innumerable coffees, and across the occasional lunch or dinner table. Several worked with me as research assistants: Abby Swingen (now of Auburn University), Ryan Frace (now of Wellesley College), Brent Sirota (now of North Carolina State University), Gerry Siarny, and Alice Wolfram. Others have read chapters, discussed themes, and provided invaluable insights, including Amanda Behm, Lisa Diller, Chris Dudley, Amy Dunagin, Justin DuRivage, Arvind Elangovan, Jessica Hanser, Elizabeth Herman, Sarah Kinkel, Fredrik Jonsson, Megan Lindsay, Leslie Theibert, James Vaughn, and Heather Welland. I could not have brought the manuscript to a conclusion without the incredible help of Alice Wolfram. Alice read every chapter several times, helped chase down images, and patiently waited as I missed every one of my self-imposed deadlines.

Many, many friends and scholars have read and commented on sections of the manuscript. In particular, Peter Lake, Jim Livesey, Frank Trentmann, Alan Houston, Don Herzog, and Adam Fox have provided reliable sounding boards throughout the project. Meg Jacobs has had many useful suggestions and was always willing at a moment's notice to look at particularly turgid bits of my prose. In the later stages of the project Chris Rogers,

my editor at Yale University Press, provided critical nudges that I very much hope have made this a better and more readable book.

My greatest debt, of course, is owed to my long-suffering family. Sam has lived with this book as long as he has lived with me. I only wish this book had developed as much as he grown as a physical being, as a student, and above all as a person. Andy has only the vaguest notions that this book was being written. Nevertheless his 5:00 a.m. wakeup calls have provided great inspiration. For David, “going to the office” is the moral equivalent of “going to the playground,” only that Daddy gets to stay in his office longer than anyone will allow Day-Day to stay at the playground. But Day-Day is right to think that writing this book has been a whole lot of fun. Above all I want to thank my wife, Sue, who has been an academic model, a stern critic, and a loving companion. Without her support, encouragement, criticism, and compassion this book would never have been written. Without her this book (probably) and my life (certainly) would be less rich.

This page intentionally left blank

PART I

Introductory

Introduction

England's Glorious Revolution of 1688–89 holds a special place in our understanding of the modern world and the revolutions that had a hand in shaping it. For the better part of three centuries scholars and public intellectuals identified England's Revolution of 1688–89 as a defining moment in England's exceptional history. Political philosophers have associated it with the origins of liberalism. Sociologists have contrasted it with the French, Russian, and Chinese revolutions. Historians have pointed to the Revolution as confirming the unusual nature of the English state. Scholars of literature and culture highlight the Revolution of 1688–89 as an important moment in defining English common sense and moderation. All of these interpretations derive their power from a deeply held and widely repeated narrative of England's Revolution of 1688–89. Unfortunately, that narrative is wrong. Replacing that historical narrative with a new one will necessarily force us to revise many of the basic historical, political, moral, and sociological categories we use to make sense of the modern world. This book aims to explain both the ways in which this traditional view is mistaken and why that view has been so widely accepted for such a long time. The old narrative emphasized the Revolution of 1688–89 as a great moment in which the English *defended* their unique way of life. The argument I advance in this book is that the English revolutionaries *created* a new kind of modern state. It was that new state that has proved so influential in shaping the modern world.

Men and women all over the English-speaking world once knew what happened in England's Revolution of 1688–89. In 1685, the Catholic King James II inherited the crown of England. In 1689 the English people agreed to replace him with the Protestants King William III and Queen Mary II. In the intervening years, James II gradually and

myopically alienated the moderate and sensible English people. He did this in a series of well-known missteps. In late 1685 he overreacted to the romantic but hopeless rebellion of his nephew, the Protestant Duke of Monmouth, by judicially murdering hundreds of humble inhabitants of the English West Country in the Bloody Assizes. Determined to improve the social and political status of his Catholic coreligionists, James then ran roughshod over English law. He insisted on his right to defy parliamentary statute and awarded Roman Catholics military and naval commissions. In 1687 he used his newly formed and illegal ecclesiastical commission to force England's Protestant universities to accept Roman Catholic fellows. When the fellows of Magdalen College Oxford resisted their king's demands, he had the dons stripped of their fellowships, turning the institution into a Catholic seminary.

According to this once well-known narrative, after James II had failed to persuade the House of Commons or the House of Lords to repeal England's laws against Roman Catholicism, he decided to emasculate Parliament. He first asserted his right to nullify the Test Acts and Penal Laws. These parliamentary statutes—requiring, in the case of the Test Acts, that all political or military officeholders take the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England and, in the case of the Penal Laws, punishing those who officiated at or attended non-Church of England services—had successfully insulated the English from Continental Catholic practices. Then James determined to have his royal fiat ratified by a Parliament packed with men whom he knew would do his bidding. When, in June 1688, seven bishops of the Church of England defied James II by refusing to have his Declaration of Indulgence, emasculating the Penal Laws and Test Acts, read from England's pulpits on the grounds of its illegality, James had the seven prelates dragged into court for a show trial. That even a carefully picked English jury acquitted the bishops demonstrated the extent to which the English were willing to go in support of their king. Soon after the trial, the English invited the Dutchman William III, Prince of Orange, to England to vindicate their religious and political liberty.

The English people enthusiastically welcomed William on his arrival in the west of England in 1688. James's army quickly melted away after a series of spectacular defections, including that of the future Duke of Marlborough. James himself, preceded by his wife and newborn son, fled to France. The English people, in what was thought to have been a remarkable moment of political unanimity, agreed to replace James with William and Mary in February 1689. The English justified the crowning of the new monarchs with the publication of the Declaration of Right, detailing the ways that James II had violated English law, thereby insisting on the limited power of English kings. In the traditional account of the Glorious Revolution, the English people, led by their natural leaders in the two Houses of Parliament, changed the English polity in the slightest of ways in 1688–89. They slightly altered the succession, they made it illegal for a Catholic ever to inherit the throne, and they passed the Toleration Act, allowing Protestant Dissenters to worship freely. There were, to be sure, some significant unintended consequences of this bloodless

revolution. But these outcomes were to be understood less as a direct consequence of these events than as the natural outgrowth of the English national character—a character that the Catholicizing Stuart monarchs had done much to pervert.

This was the story that every English schoolchild, and many North American ones, used to know. This was the story that the great Victorian historian Thomas Babington Macaulay laid out in his magisterial *History of England*, first published in the middle of the nineteenth century. That *History* was an immediate and runaway best seller and has deservedly been deeply influential ever since. Macaulay told his story in beautiful and accessible prose. He based his account on exhaustive research. Any scholar with an interest in the late seventeenth century should begin his or her research by examining Macaulay's notes, now preserved in the British Library. Very few subsequent scholars of the events Macaulay described have achieved his level of archival mastery. And in many ways, subsequent scholars have quibbled with the details of Macaulay's story while accepting his general thesis.

Macaulay's thesis became *the* classic statement of the Whig interpretation of the Revolution of 1688–89. It had a number of distinctive facets. First, the revolution was unrevolutionary. Unlike other subsequent revolutions, England's revolution was bloodless, consensual, aristocratic, and above all sensible. The English had no desire to transform their polity, their society, or their culture. Instead they worried that James II had intended to do just that. Second, the revolution was Protestant. James II had tried to reinstitute Catholicism in England. The revolution insured that England would remain a Protestant polity. Third, the revolution demonstrated the fundamentally exceptional nature of English national character. Continental Europeans vacillated between the wild extremes of republican and popular government on the one hand and tyrannical royal absolutism on the other. The English, by contrast, were committed to limited monarchy, allowing just the right amount of tempered popular liberty. Just as the English church was a sensible middle way between the extremes of Roman Catholicism and radical Protestant sectarianism, so the English polity, by maintaining its ancient constitution, was sensible and moderate. In this context the English remained committed to their hierarchical social structure precisely because it did not impose unbridgeable gaps between the aristocracy and the people. Fourth, there could have been no social grievances undergirding the Revolution of 1688–89 because English society had changed little in the period before James II's flight. It was only after English property rights were secured by the revolution, only after absolutism was no longer possible in England, that the English economy could truly flourish.

This book challenges every element of this established account. It is my claim that England's Revolution of 1688–89 was the first modern revolution. I came to this conclusion after more than a decade of research in archives across the United Kingdom, North America, and Europe. Macaulay built his story on a mountain of evidence; but much new material has become available in the intervening century and a half, and new bibliographic techniques have made it easier to locate materials. Macaulay assumed he knew

what a Catholic king must have wanted to achieve; but I decided to try to uncover the aims, ideals, and contexts in which James II and his Catholic advisers operated. Macaulay assumed that European affairs were of little interest to the English people; I chose, by contrast, to take seriously the mass of ephemeral publications discussing Continental power politics. Macaulay assumed that conflicts over economic policy would become central political questions only in his own day; I chose, instead, to investigate the links between the aspirations and activities of England's merchant communities and late-seventeenth-century politics. I have benefited immensely from the research of twentieth-century scholars into England's social and economic history. All told this new historical evidence, it seems to me, makes it possible to tell a radically different story about the Revolution of 1688–89. In this story the English experience is not exceptional but in fact typical (if precocious) of states experiencing modern revolutions. The Revolution of 1688–89 is important not because it reaffirmed the exceptional English national character but because it was a landmark moment in the emergence of the modern state.

England in the later seventeenth century was rapidly becoming a modern society. Its economy was booming. Its towns were growing and becoming more comfortable. Its trade was expanding. These developments made it possible for English statesmen to conceive of a more active role for the English government. But social and economic change did not make the Revolution of 1688–89 inevitable. James II, deeply influenced by the particular brand of Catholicism he practiced and by the successful political model of his cousin, Louis XIV of France, sought to develop a modern absolutist state. James and his supporters created a centralizing bureaucratic state, a professional standing army, and a world-class navy. At the same time, James fashioned a modern Catholic polity. James, like his cousin Louis XIV, wanted Catholic subjects but not a papal overlord. Instead James insisted on absolute sovereignty within his own dominion while at the same time seeking to Catholicize his Protestant country. James successfully promoted the spread of Catholic apologetic literature, the proliferation of Catholic schools and colleges, and the opening of Catholic churches. No one living through the 1680s in England could have failed to appreciate the new prominence of Catholicism in English everyday life. James and his advisers appreciated that his modern state needed an expanding set of resources to support his more interventionist state. They quickly concluded that a centralized overseas territorial empire, with bases in India, North America, and the West Indies were essential props. James marshaled newly available resources, and devised plans for a vastly increased empire, to create a modern Catholic state.

James's opponents were, by and large, revolutionaries, not reactionaries. They appreciated that only a modernized English state could compete in contemporary Europe. Unlike James, however, the revolutionaries looked to the Dutch Republic rather than to the French monarchy for political inspiration. They, too, wanted a state that could support a powerful army and a first-class navy. They, too, imagined that such a state would have to be centralized and interventionist. But unlike James and his advisers, the revolutionaries

imagined that England would be most powerful if it encouraged political participation rather than absolutism, if it were religiously tolerant rather than Catholicizing, and if it were devoted to promoting English manufactures rather than maintaining a landed empire. The revolutionaries understood full well that these political preferences put them at ideological loggerheads with Louis XIV's modern Catholic monarchy. The revolutionaries were therefore fully committed to fighting an all-out war against France, not only to protect the British Isles against a potential French-backed Jacobite restoration, but also to ensure that there would be European markets available to English manufactures and that European liberty would be preserved against French-style absolutism.

James II and his opponents did not only advocate radically different modernizing programs, they also were able to deploy a modern arsenal of political tools. James had succeeded in raising, maintaining, and deploying an efficient and disciplined army. He was in the process of molding most corporations throughout England and Wales into loyal instruments of local politics. James used the press and various political institutions to spread his regime's values and silence alternative viewpoints. James's regime may look brief and fragile in retrospect, but from the perspective of the later seventeenth century he had created a powerful edifice. It was precisely because James had been able to create such a powerful state that many of James's opponents realized that it could only be resisted with violence and that only a revolutionary transformation could prevent a future English monarch from re-creating his modern absolutist state. Those who overthrew James II in 1688 and shaped the new regime in the following decade were necessarily revolutionaries.

Though we have come to view the Glorious Revolution as bloodless, aristocratic, and consensual, the actual event was none of these things. The Revolution of 1688–89 was, of course, less bloody than the violent revolutions of the twentieth century, but the English endured a scale of violence against property and persons similar to that of the French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century.¹ English men and women throughout the country threatened one another, destroyed each other's property, and killed and maimed one another throughout the revolutionary period. English men and women, from London to Newcastle, from Plymouth to Norwich, experienced violence or threats of violence, or lived in terrifying fear of violence. This was not a tame event. Nor was it a staid negotiation conducted by elites. Men and women of all social categories took to the streets, marched in arms on England's byways and highways, and donated huge amounts of money—some in very small quantities—to support the revolutionary cause. When the members of the House of Lords tried calmly to settle the succession issue after James II had fled the country, an angry crowd numbering in the tens of thousands cut short the nobles' deliberations and forced their hands. Given the power, efficiency, and ideological cohesion of James II's new regime, it was not surprising that many supported their king with great enthusiasm even in 1688 and beyond. Since many of the revolutionaries sought to replace James II's French-style modernization program with one based on a Dutch model, it was also predictable that many others would support the undoing of James II's

new state edifice while doing everything they could to prevent the creation a Williamite alternative. The English throughout the 1680s, 1690s, and thereafter were politically and ideologically divided. There was no moment of English cohesion against an un-English king. There was no period in the late seventeenth century in which the sensible people of England collaborated to rid themselves against an irrational monarch. The Revolution of 1688–89 was, like all other revolutions, violent, popular, and divisive.

My central argument in this book, then, is that the English in the later seventeenth century forged the first modern revolution. This revolution had long-term causes and long-term consequences. The English could not have transformed their state and society in the ways that they did in the 1680s and 1690s had the events of the previous century—especially those of the crisis of the 1640s and 1650s—not unleashed a series of ideological debates that informed and transformed conceptions of state, religion, and society. English politicians, whether supporters of James II or of William and Mary, could not have transformed England's state institutions had the English economy not diverged from the late-seventeenth-century European pattern of recession and retrenchment. Because there were long-term causes of the Glorious Revolution, the consequences of that revolution were not necessarily unintended. The creation of the Bank of England, war against France, and religious toleration were all explicit goals of many of the revolutionaries. Precisely because the debates over these issues had long pedigrees, it would be wrong to understand 1688 or 1689 as a fundamental break in English history. The debates over these issues continued, albeit modified and reshaped by new institutional realities. Early Modern England did not come to an end in 1688, nor did Modern England begin then. It would, however, be fair to say that the character of English state and society relations was fundamentally transformed.

The revolutionaries created a new kind of English state after 1689. They rejected the modern, bureaucratic absolutist state model developed by Louis XIV in France. But they did not reject the state. Instead the revolutionaries created a state that was intrusive in different ways. Their state sought to transform England from an agrarian into a manufacturing society, oversaw the massive military buildup that was necessary to fight a war against the greatest military power that Europe had ever seen, and sought to promote a religiously tolerant society. John Locke, often described as one of the earliest and most influential liberal thinkers, was one of these revolutionaries. If the Glorious Revolution was a critical moment in the development of modern liberalism, that liberalism was not antagonistic to the state. The liberalism spawned in 1688–89 was revolutionary and interventionist rather than moderate and antistatist.

The Glorious Revolution, in my view, was not the triumph of a group of modernizers over defenders of traditional society. Instead the revolution pitted two groups of modernizers against each other. Both sides tried, against long odds, to appeal for the hearts and minds of the reactionaries. This, I believe, was a pattern typical of all modern revolutions. Revolutionary situations, in the vast majority of cases, have been created when

the regime in power decides, for whatever reason, that it needs to modernize. In so doing the regime extends the tendrils of the state deeper and more extensively into society than they had ever gone before, necessarily generating resentment. At the same time, by announcing a break with the past, the regime has lowered the bar for opposition movements. Potential revolutionaries no longer need to persuade their fellow subjects to break with traditional and trusted ways of life. They merely need to persuade them that they have a superior model for change. The regime in power can no longer rely on the habitual loyalty of elites. The revolutionaries of late-seventeenth-century England set the model for this now typical political pattern.

What do I mean by modern, modernizers, and modernization? The terms have become flashpoints in contemporary public discussion. Many scholars, scholars for whom I have the utmost respect, would prefer that we do away with them or at least severely limit their use.² These scholars, and many others, dislike the family of terms around “modernity” for two reasons. First, it is said that the term *modern* or *modernity* is never specified. It is a term that means everything and nothing. Second, it is claimed that modernization stories are always reading history backward from the perspective of contemporary advanced democracies. All modernization stories are measured against the outcome of modern capitalist (read non–state interventionist) democracy. These are serious concerns. When, throughout this book, I use the terms *modernization*, *modernity*, or *modern* I mean them in very specific ways. I do not conceive of modernity as a coherent and integrated whole. Nor do I think modernization implies one narrow and particular path. Instead, it makes sense to discuss an epochal break in the construction of the state, and perhaps only the state, in later seventeenth-century Europe as a whole, and in England in particular. Although changes in the state, I believe, had profound consequences for foreign policy, the nature of imperial aspirations, English economy, and English society, I am not asserting that modernization determined these outcomes. In fact, it is my central claim that different conceptions of the modern state made possible different political and social consequences. Above all, I am not saying that state modernization necessarily implied a complete and total break with the past in intellectual, religious, or social life.

What, then, do I mean by the emergence of a modern state? I mean two interrelated sets of changes. I mean, first, a set of sociostructural innovations in statecraft. State modernizers usually try to centralize and bureaucratize political authority. They attempt to transform and professionalize the military. They use the tools of the state to accelerate economic growth and shape the contours of society. They undertake to gather directly detailed information about and occasionally suppress social and political activities taking place in a wide range of geographical locales and social levels within the polity. Second, a modern state implies an ideological break with the past. State modernizers insist on their own novelty, on a sense that they are undertaking a project that is utterly new. James II frequently mentioned that he was basing his state on a “New Magna Carta.” One of those active on the other side in 1688, John Evelyn, hoped that the consequence of the revolution

sample content of 1688: The First Modern Revolution (The Lewis Walpole Series in Eighteenth-Century Culture and History)

- [**read What the Dog Knows: The Science and Wonder of Working Dogs**](#)
- [download online The Cutting Room](#)
- [download online Midnight Over Sanctaphrax \(The Edge Chronicles, Book 3; The Twig Trilogy, Book 3\) here](#)
- [*The Gossamer Years: The Diary of a Noblewoman of Heian Japan here*](#)
- [**Mindfulness for Bipolar Disorder: How Mindfulness and Neuroscience Can Help You Manage Your Bipolar Symptoms pdf, azw \(kindle\)**](#)
- [*click Curse of the Ancients \(Infinity Ring, Book 4\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub*](#)

- <http://www.khoi.dk/?books/What-the-Dog-Knows--The-Science-and-Wonder-of-Working-Dogs.pdf>
- <http://aircon.servicessingaporecompany.com/?lib/The-Cutting-Room.pdf>
- <http://qolorea.com/library/Midnight-Over-Sanctaphrax--The-Edge-Chronicles--Book-3--The-Twig-Trilogy--Book-3-.pdf>
- <http://aneventshop.com/ebooks/Vegan-Cooking-For-Dummies.pdf>
- <http://interactmg.com/ebooks/Mindfulness-for-Bipolar-Disorder--How-Mindfulness-and-Neuroscience-Can-Help-You-Manage-Your-Bipolar-Symptoms.pdf>
- <http://fitnessfatale.com/freebooks/Curse-of-the-Ancients--Infinity-Ring--Book-4-.pdf>