

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

Chapter 1 : Social and Political Impact of the First Phase of the Industrial Revolution | calendrierdelascience

In Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution, Christopher Hill takes up themes that have emerged from a lifetime's investigation into the causes of the English Revolution. However, Hill does more than analyze the origins of the Revolution.

The kings had so thoroughly centralized the system that most nobles spent their time at Versailles, and played only a small direct role in their home districts. Thompson says that the kings had: The king was a figurehead, the nobility had lost all their titles and most of their land, the Church lost its monasteries and farmlands, bishops, judges and magistrates were elected by the people, the army was almost helpless, with military power in the hands of the new revolutionary National Guard. From the social point of view, the Revolution consisted in the suppression of what was called the feudal system, in the emancipation of the individual, in greater division of landed property, the abolition of the privileges of noble birth, the establishment of equality, the simplification of life. The French Revolution differed from other revolutions in being not merely national, for it aimed at benefiting all humanity. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. War broke out in as Austria and Prussia invaded France, but were defeated at the Battle of Valmy. French emigration " To escape political tensions and save their lives, a number of individuals, mostly men, emigrated from France. Many settled in neighboring countries chiefly Great Britain, Germany, Austria, and Prussia, and quite a few went to the United States. The presence of these thousands of Frenchmen of varying socioeconomic backgrounds who had just fled a hotbed of revolutionary activity posed a problem for the nations that extended refuge to the migrants. The fear was that they brought with them a plot to disrupt the political order, which did lead to increased regulation and documentation of the influx of immigrants in neighboring countries. Still, most nations such as Britain remained magnanimous and welcomed the French. French conquests[edit] In foreign affairs, the French Army at first was quite successful. It conquered the Austrian Netherlands approximately modern-day Belgium and turned it into another province of France. It conquered the Dutch Republic the present Netherlands, and made it a puppet state. It took control of the German areas on the left bank of the Rhine River and set up a puppet regime. It conquered Switzerland and most of Italy, setting up a series of puppet states. The result was glory for France, and an infusion of much needed money from the conquered lands, which also provided direct support to the French Army. It scored a series of victories that rolled back French successes, and The French Army trapped in Egypt. Napoleon himself slipped through the British blockade in October, returning to Paris. He set up a series of new republics, complete with new codes of law and abolition of old feudal privileges. Genoa the city became a republic while its hinterland became the Ligurian Republic. The Roman Republic was formed out of the papal holdings while the pope himself was sent to France. The Neapolitan Republic was formed around Naples, but it lasted only five months before the enemy forces of the Coalition recaptured it. Their political and administrative systems were modernized, the metric system introduced, and trade barriers reduced. Jewish ghettos were abolished. Belgium and Piedmont became integral parts of France. However, Artz emphasizes the benefits the Italians gained from the French Revolution: For nearly two decades the Italians had the excellent codes of law, a fair system of taxation, a better economic situation, and more religious and intellectual toleration than they had known for centuries. Everywhere old physical, economic, and intellectual barriers had been thrown down and the Italians had begun to be aware of a common nationality. Hayes as a major result of the French Revolution across Europe. The impact on French nationalism was profound. Napoleon became such a heroic symbol of the nation that the glory was easily picked up by his nephew, who was overwhelmingly elected president and later became Emperor Napoleon III. Britain saw minority support for the French Revolution, but the majority, especially the elite, were strongly opposed. Britain led and funded the series of coalitions that fought France from to, and then restored the Bourbons. Edmund Burke was the chief spokesman for the opposition. It stimulated the demand for further reform

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

throughout Ireland, especially in Ulster. The upshot was a revolt in 1798, led by Wolfe Tone, that was crushed by Britain. This section needs additional citations for verification. December Main article: At first it brought liberal and democratic ideas, the end of guilds, of serfdom and of the Jewish ghetto. It brought economic freedoms and agrarian and legal reform. German intellectuals celebrated the outbreak, hoping to see the triumph of Reason and The Enlightenment. There were enemies as well, as the royal courts in Vienna and Berlin denounced the overthrow of the king and the threatened spread of notions of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Reformers said the solution was to have faith in the ability of Germans to reform their laws and institutions in peaceful fashion. The map text is in German After Prussia was humiliated by Napoleon opinion swung against France and stimulated and shaped German nationalism. The most important impact came from the abolition of all feudal privileges and historic taxes, the introduction of legal reforms of the Napoleonic Code, and the reorganization of the judicial and local administrative systems. The economic integration of the Rhineland with France increased prosperity, especially in industrial production, while business accelerated with the new efficiency and lowered trade barriers. The Jews were liberated from the ghetto. One sour point was the hostility of the French officials toward the Roman Catholic Church, the choice of most of the residents. Much of South Germany felt a similar but more muted influence of the French Revolution, while in Prussia and areas to the east there was far less impact. Decades later workers and peasants in the Rhineland often appealed to Jacobinism to oppose unpopular government programs, while the intelligentsia demanded the maintenance of the Napoleonic Code which was stayed in effect for a century. Helvetic Republic The French invaded Switzerland and turned it into an ally known as the " Helvetic Republic " "â€” The interference with localism and traditional liberties was deeply resented, although some modernizing reforms took place. The French Army suppressed the uprisings but support for revolutionary ideals steadily declined, as the Swiss resented their loss of local democracy, the new taxes, the centralization, and the hostility to religion. The aristocrats, seeking the restoration of the Old Swiss Confederacy and a section of the population wanting a coup. Furthermore, Switzerland became a battleground between the armies of France, Austria and Russia. Ultimately, this instability, frequent coups within the government and the eventual Bourla-papey forced Napoleon to sign the Act of Medallion which led to the fall of the Helvetic Republic and the restoration of the Confederacy. The long-term impact of the French Revolution has been assessed by Martin: It proclaimed the equality of citizens before the law, equality of languages, freedom of thought and faith; it created a Swiss citizenship, basis of our modern nationality, and the separation of powers, of which the old regime had no conception; it suppressed internal tariffs and other economic restraints; it unified weights and measures, reformed civil and penal law, authorized mixed marriages between Catholics and Protestants, suppressed torture and improved justice; it developed education and public works. The French imposed reforms and incorporated the territory into France. New rulers were sent in by Paris. Belgian men were drafted into the French wars and heavily taxed. Nearly everyone was Catholic, but the Church was repressed. Resistance was strong in every sector, as Belgian nationalism emerged to oppose French rule. The French legal system, however, was adopted, with its equal legal rights, and abolition of class distinctions. Belgium now had a government bureaucracy selected by merit. France promoted commerce and capitalism, paving the way for the ascent of the bourgeoisie and the rapid growth of manufacturing and mining.

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

Chapter 2 : Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution by Christopher Hill

Scholars and students of Tudor-Stuart and English revolutionary history will welcome this provocative commentary by an eminent English historian on some crucial problems of English history and intellectual thought. In a previous book, The Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution (

The Revolution Preface SOME slight changes have been made for the third editions of this essay, first published in More substantial revision and expansion would be needed to incorporate the results of recent work on the period, especially that of Maurice Dobb in his *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*. Meanwhile this essay must stand as a first approximation, with all its crudities and oversimplifications. For documentary evidence for some of my generalisations the reader may be referred to *The Good Old Cause*, published by Lawrence and Wishart in It may help if I attempt here a definition of two terms which seem to have caused some misunderstanding. I use the word feudal in the Marxist sense, and not in the more restricted sense adopted by most academic historians to describe narrowly military and legal relations. The mass of the population consists of dependent peasants subsisting on the produce of their family holdings. The landowners are maintained by the rent paid by the peasants, which might be in the form of food or labour, as in early days, or by the sixteenth century in money. Merchant capital can develop within feudalism without changing the mode of production; a challenge to the old ruling class and its state comes only with the development of the capitalist mode of production in industry and agriculture. The word progressive as used in this essay does not necessarily imply moral approval. It means simply that the tendency or social group so described contributed to the expansion of the wealth of the community. Nevertheless, more wealth was produced: Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Spain show what such stagnation would have meant for the political and cultural life of the community. In the long run the creation of new wealth by the rise of capitalism in England opened up the possibility of a more equitable. Equality and a Communal spirit, combined with a reasonable and rising ng, only became attainable after capitalism has historical task of laying the industrial foundation society. Hence to-day we can at last see our way to realising the dreams of the Levellers and Diggers in Introduction THE object of this essay is to suggest an interpretation of the events of the seventeenth century different from that which most of us were taught at school. To summarise it briefly, this interpretation is that the English Revolution of was a great social movement like the French Revolution of The state power protecting an old order that was essentially feudal was violently overthrown, power passed into the hands of a new class, and so the freer development of capitalism was made possible. The Civil War was a class war, in which the despotism of Charles I was defended by the reactionary forces of the established Church and conservative landlords. Parliament beat the King because it could appeal to the enthusiastic support of the trading and industrial classes in town and countryside, to the yeomen and progressive gentry, and to wider masses of the population whenever they were able by free discussion to understand what the struggle was really about. The rest of this essay will try to prove and illustrate these generalisations. The orthodox attitude to the seventeenth-century revolution is misleading because it does not try to penetrate below the surface, because it takes the actors in the revolution at their face value, and assumes that the best way to find out what people were fighting about is to consider what the leaders said they were fighting about. We all know that during the seventeenth century England underwent a profound political revolution. But why did this happen? What was it all about? Has it any significance for us at the present day? These questions are not usually very satisfactorily answered in the text-books. The bloodshed and violence which accompanied the revolution are slurred over as regrettable incidents, when Englishmen for once descended to the wicked continental practice of fighting one another about politics. But that was only because mistakes were made, opportunities for British compromise were mined: So they do not ever give us reasons which would seem to us sufficient to justify the devotion and the sacrifices of our ancestors in their struggles. The most usual explanation of the seventeenth-century revolution is one that was put forward by the leaders of the Parliament of themselves in their propaganda

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

statements and appeals to the people. It has been repeated with additional detail and adornments by Whig and Liberal historians ever since. This explanation says that the Parliamentary armies were fighting for the liberty of the individual and his rights in law against a tyrannical Government that threw him into prison without trial by jury, taxed him without asking his consent, billeted soldiers in his house, robbed him of his property, and attempted to destroy his cherished Parliamentary institutions. Now all this is true – as far as it goes. The Stuarts did try to stop people meeting and holding political discussions, did cut off the ears of people who criticised the Government. All that is true. And although Parliament in the seventeenth century was even less genuinely representative of ordinary people than it is at the present day, still its victory was important as establishing a certain amount of self-government for the richer classes in society. But further questions are still unanswered. Why did the become tyrannical? Why did the landed and commercial classes represented in Parliament have to fight for their liberties? During the sixteenth century, under the Tudor rulers, the grandfathers of the Parliamentarians of were. What had happened to change their outlook? Parliament had supported Henry VII and Henry VIII and Elizabeth in their efforts to police the country against the anarchy and brigandage of over-mighty subjects, of feudal potentates with their private armies, and England had been made safe for commercialism. Parliament, finally, encouraged Queen Elizabeth in her resistance to the political ally of the Papacy, the Spanish Empire, and the plunder of the New World was thrown open to Drake, Hawkins and the piratical but Protestant seadogs. The Tudors, in short, were backed by the politically effective classes because the latter did very well out of Tudor rule. It was not just because James, who succeeded Elizabeth in , was a particularly stupid man, a Scot who did not understand England, though many historians have seriously argued thus. But one has only to read what James, Charles and their supporters wrote and said, or examine what they did, to see that so far from being merely stupid, they were either able men trying to impose a vicious policy, or men whose ideas were hopelessly out of date and therefore reactionary. The causes of the civil war must be sought in society, not in individuals. Their idea is that Charles I and his advisers were really trying to protect ordinary people from economic exploitation by a small class of capitalists on the make; and that the opposition which faced Charles was organised and worked up to serve their own purposes by those business men who identified their interests with the House of Commons in politics and Puritanism in religion. Now, it is true that the English Revolution of , like the French Revolution of , was a struggle for political, economic and religious power, waged by the middle class, the bourgeoisie, which grew in wealth and strength as capitalism developed. But it is not true that as against them the royal Government stood for the interests of the common people: It represented the landowning nobles, and its policy was influenced by a Court clique of aristocratic commercial racketeers and their hangers-on, sucking the life-blood from the whole people by methods of economic exploitation which we shall be considering later on. The middle-class struggle to shake off the control of this group was not merely selfish; it fulfilled a progressive historical function. The sharper-witted landowners were grafting themselves as parasites on to the new growth of capitalism, since own mode of economic existence no longer sufficed to maintain them. It was necessary for the further development of capitalism that this choking parasitism should be ended by the overthrow of the feudal state. It was to the advantage of the masses of the population that capitalism should be allowed to develop freely. Under the old order, in the century before , real wages for labourers in industry and agriculture fell more than one half: The new economic developments of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries made the old economic and social and political system hopelessly out of date. Those of its defenders regretfully back to the stability and relative the peasantry in the Middle Ages were quite unrealistic and in effect reactionary. But fine words alter no historic processes. These two theories, then, are both one-sided. The Whigs stress the progressive nature of the revolution, and slur over the fact that the class that took the lead in the revolution and most profited by its achievements was the bourgeoisie. Their interpretation perpetuates the legend that the interests of the bourgeoisie are identical with those of the nation, a legend obviously convenient for our own day, though so much less true now than in the seventeenth century. The Tories, on the other hand, stress the class nature of the revolution in an attempt to deny its progressiveness and value in its own time, to whitewash

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

feudalism, and to suggest that revolutions never benefit more than a narrow clique. A recent version suggests that all politics is a dirty game, all principles are eye-wash, all revolutions useless. A third and more familiar theory is emphasised by both sides: Here, again, the effect of this explanation is to make us pity and misunderstand the men of the seventeenth century, and. But this is to miss the point. Certainly religious squabbles fill many pages of the pamphlet literature of the seventeenth century: The Church throughout the Middle Ages, and down to the seventeenth century, was something very different from what we call a Church to-day. It guided all the movements of men from baptism to the burial service, and was the gateway to that life to come in which all men fervently believed. The parish itself was or an important unit of local government, collecting and doling out such pittance as the poor received. It took the place of news and propaganda services now covered by many different and more efficient institutions – the Press, the B. That is why men took notes at sermons; it is also why the government often told preachers exactly what to preach. Bancroft, a prelate of late Elizabethan times, mocked at the Puritan claim to be dealing simply with Church matters. For God is not a God of sedition and confusion, but of order and of peace. For the same reason, those who wanted to overthrow the feudal state had to attack and seize control of the Church. That is why political theories tended to get wrapped up in religious language. It was not that our seventeenth-century forefathers were much more conscientious and saintly men than we are. Whatever may be true of Ireland or Spain, we in England to-day can see our problems in secular terms just because our ancestors put an end to the use of the Church as an exclusive and persecuting instrument of political masters, not because we are wiser and better, but because Cromwell, stabling in cathedrals the horses of the most disciplined and most democratic cavalry the world had yet seen, won a victory which for ever stopped men being flogged and branded for having unorthodox views about the Communion service. As long as the power of the State was weak and uncentralised, the Church with its parson in every parish, the parson with honoured access to every household, could tell people what to believe and how to behave; and behind the threats and censures of the Church were all the terrors of hell fire. Under these circumstances social conflicts inevitably became religious conflicts. But the fact that men spoke and wrote in religious language should not prevent us realising that there is a social content behind what are apparently purely theological ideas. Each class created and sought to impose the religious outlook best suited to its own needs and interests. But the real clash is between these class interests: What men were fighting about was the whole nature and future development of English society. This will be illustrated in the following pages, but it is worth showing now that contemporaries knew perfectly well what it was all about, far better, in fact, than many later historians. It was not merely that, when the victory of the bourgeoisie had been achieved, thinkers like Winstanley, Harrington, Neville, Defoe recognised that the war had been primarily a struggle over property. Shrewd politicians showed in the heat of the contest that they knew well enough who their opponents were. The comparison with the bourgeois republics is constantly recurring in Parliamentary writings. And most of the tenants of these gentlemen, and also most of the poorest of the people, whom the others call the rabble, did follow the gentry and were for the King. The overwhelming mass of the population lived in the countryside, engaged either wholly or partially in producing foodstuffs or wool. For centuries English society had been feudal, made up of isolated local communities producing for their own consumption with, very little trade between them. But gradually from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries a change began to come over the structure of this agricultural community. The food and wool from the village began to sell far afield: In I, moreover, Christopher Columbus had discovered America. English merchants followed him there, and also penetrated overseas to India and Russia. As industry and commerce developed, as the overseas market for English cloth expanded, some areas ceased to be economically self-sufficient, and had to be fed and supplied with wool for their looms.

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

Chapter 3 : Influence of the French Revolution - Wikipedia

Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution Christopher Hill Curti Lectures "[Hill's] subject is the Revolution of and its effects, but he ranges more generally from the transformations in English society to the latter decades of the seventeenth century as well.

Share via Email Christopher Hill, who has died aged 91, was the commanding interpreter of 17th-century England, and of much else besides. As a public figure, he achieved his greatest fame as master of Balliol College, Oxford, a post he held from until . Yet it was as the defining Marxist historian of the century of revolution, the title of one of the most widely studied of his many books, that he became known to generations of students around the world. For all these, too, he will always be the master. It would be a pardonable exaggeration to say that Hill created the way in which the people of late 20th-century Britain - and the left in particular - looked at the history of 17th-century England. As he never tired of pointing out, some of the themes he illuminated so richly had already been explored by left-wing scholars in the s. But from , when he published his tercentenary essay, *The English Revolution* , his own voluminously expanding and unfailingly literate work became the starting point of most subsequent interpretation, even for those who rejected his method and conclusions. No historian of recent times was so synonymous with his period of study; he is the reason why most of us know anything about the 17th century at all. He was, EP Thompson once said, the dean and paragon of English historians. Hill was born in York, where his father was a solicitor. His parents were Methodists, a fact to which he attributed his lifelong political and intellectual apostasy. Though his life was to be the embodiment of a secularised form of dissent, his high moral seriousness and egalitarianism surely had roots in this radical Protestant background. Galbraith, in particular, was to remain an immense influence. Academic honours regularly fell his way, starting with the prestigious Lothian prize in , and continuing with a first-class degree in and an All Souls fellowship that winter. But he was a successful rugby player too, the scorer of a famous cup-winning try for Balliol. Even more lastingly, he had become a Marxist. Exactly when and why this happened is uncertain, since Hill was always notoriously inscrutable about discussing his personal life. He once claimed it came about through trying to make sense of the 17th-century metaphysical poets, but although he read Marx as an undergraduate, the moment of his conversion to communism is elusive. In , he spent a year in the Soviet Union, during which he was very ill, but also formed a lasting affection for Russian life - and a somewhat less lasting one for Soviet politics. After Moscow, he had two years as an assistant lecturer at University College, Cardiff, before returning to Balliol as a fellow and tutor in modern history. In , he was commissioned as a lieutenant in the Oxford and Bucks Light Infantry, before becoming a major in the intelligence corps and being seconded to the Foreign Office from until the end of the war. This was, to put it mildly, an intriguing period, about which he rarely let fall much detail. By this time, he had begun to publish, at first pseudonymously, articles and reviews which, among other things, did much to draw attention to the burgeoning Soviet school of English 17th-century studies. Then, in , arising out of intensive debate among a group of Marxist historians, who included Leslie Morton, Robin Page Arnot and - particularly influential on Hill - Dona Torr, came the decisive *The English Revolution* . The essay was originally published as one of a collection of three reflections the others were by Margaret James and Edgell Rickword. The book, he said, "was written very fast and in a good deal of anger, [and] was intended to be my last will and testament. It also generated the path-breaking collection of documents, *The Good Old Cause*, that he edited with Dell in . The active, year involvement with communism, which also led to his short biography, *Lenin And The Russian Revolution* , came to a crisis after the Soviet invasion of Hungary in . Both issues came to a head in the late weeks of , though his own break did not come until the following year. He was appointed to a CP review of inner-party democracy, but the rejection of the critical minority report, written by Hill with Peter Cadogan and Malcolm MacEwen , precipitated his final departure. A wartime marriage to Inez Waugh, the former wife of a colleague, produced a home life which combined the high seriousness of Balliol Marxism

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

with an extravagant bohemianism. It also produced their daughter Fanny Hill, later a dashing figure on the Oxford scene, who drowned off the Spanish coast in her 40s. With Bridget obituary, August 13, he had a son and two daughters, one of whom died in a car accident. Hill always argued that the connection between leaving the CP and his wider fame was post-hoc rather than propter-hoc, and it is certainly true that caused no revolution let alone a counter-revolution in his analysis of the English revolution. On the other hand, the Bridget effect can hardly be underestimated. Central to the whole project was a patient fascination with religion, represented, in particular, in his attempt to understand the revolutionary power of puritanism. His use of literary sources was one of his most fascinating characteristics. Many of the tasks he set himself were laid out in his next book, *Puritanism And Revolution*. Those who heard Hill deliver the lectures on which it is based - lectures delivered in a nervous, slightly stuttering voice - will always reserve a special place for his study of radical and millenarian ideas, *The World Turned Upside Down*. His tenure was deft and collegiate, and he tried to maintain his teaching and research amid the administrative and ceremonial duties. He never seriously hid his enthusiasm for the two main innovations of his mastership - the opening of male-only Balliol to women, and the representation of students on the college governing body. He moved to Sibford Ferris, on the Cotswold hills, and, for two years, worked as a visiting professor at the Open University, an entirely characteristic effort to bring his learning to a wider audience. Then he settled down to further books: Three volumes of essays were published in the 1970s - throughout his life, Hill wrote some of his most challenging and original work in articles and reviews. Yet, for the last 20 years of his life, he became once again a more controversial figure. His methodology was famously assaulted by JH Hexter in a *Times Literary Supplement* review in 1978, and his assessment of Milton was powerfully denounced by Blair Worden. A reaction against his big reading of 17th-century history took root in the work of Conrad Russell, John Morrill and others. People always felt there was something enigmatic about Hill. Whether as a friend walking through Oxfordshire or the Dordogne, as a tutor hunched in his armchair discussing an essay - and still more on formal occasions - he kept his cards close to his chest, forcing you to do the talking, making you listen to what you were saying in the way that he was listening too. But then he would make a joke, often just a pointed ironic observation, that made you love him. As someone once said, although he affected to be severe, he could not help being benign. Hill once gave a radio talk marking the centenary of the publication of *Das Kapital*. He ended it by telling how, in old age, Marx had bumped into a fellow revolutionary from the barricades, now prosperous and complacent. The acquaintance reflected that, as one got older, one became less radical and less political. Well, I do not!

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

Chapter 4 : Obituary: Christopher Hill | Education | The Guardian

[Hill's] subject is the Revolution of and its effects, but he ranges more generally from the transformations in English society to the latter decades of the seventeenth century as well.

Social and Political Impact of the First Phase of the Industrial Revolution From to , the population of England and Wales doubled, from nine million to eighteen million. During the same period, the proportion of people living in cities rose from 10 percent to 50 percent. Put together, the population of the cities of England and Wales rose from about nine hundred thousand to nine million, a 1,000 percent increase, in fifty years. The increase in population shocked people at the time. As early as 1798, the English economist Thomas Robert Malthus "wrote an essay, "The Principles of Population," predicting widespread famine on the grounds that while population seemed to be proceeding at a geometrical rate 2, 4, 8, 16, food production was only growing at an arithmetical rate 2, 4, 6, 8. Malthus blamed the lower classes for having too many children and proposed that laws be passed limiting the number of children people were allowed to have. Although the catastrophe predicted by Malthus never occurred partly because there was a huge increase in productivity in agriculture, partly because the rate of increase in population slowed, his opinions were widely accepted at the time, particularly his conclusion that poor people were to blame for the profound social changes that accompanied the Industrial Revolution. These social changes had several causes and consequences: The consolidation of farmlands as a result of the enclosure movement, in which wealthy aristocrats petitioned the government to own lands that communities used to share, pushed poorer people off the farms and into towns and cities see Chapter 1. The dramatic rise in the number of factories provided jobs for some of these former farmers. These workers were relatively unskilled compared to master craftspeople, but they could be trained to operate the new machinery being introduced. The flow of rural people into cities overwhelmed the physical facilities. Poorly built, inexpensive houses were developed and people crowded into them. Public health facilities, such as adequate sewage systems, could not keep pace with the growth in population. Words to Know Anarchism: A social philosophy that advocates voluntary associations among people as a form of self-government, as opposed to central governments dominated by a monarch or other central figure. A form of government in which all the people own property, including both land and capital, in common. A political and economic system in which the people control both the government and also major elements of the economy, such as owning or tightly regulating factories. The nature of work in factories "long hours sixteen-hour work-days were not uncommon, monotonous labor, widespread employment of children "worsened issues of health. Low wages resulted in crowded housing, inadequate sanitation, and inadequate diets. Serious environmental changes took place. Coal was the universal fuel to power factories and heat homes. Soot, a byproduct of burnt coal, covered English cities, turning many buildings black over time and contributing to air pollution, both inside poorly ventilated factories and outside. Lack of sewage treatment plants resulted in raw human waste running into streams and rivers. As late as 1855, a leading English scientist, Michael Faraday "wrote a letter to the editor of the Times of London describing a boat ride on the River Thames, which runs through London: The appearance and the smell of the water forced themselves at once on my attention. The whole of the river was an opaque pale brown fluid. Their complexion is sallow and pallid "with a peculiar flatness of feature, caused by the want of a proper quantity of adipose substance [fat] to cushion out the cheeks. Their stature low "the average height of four hundred men, measured at different times, and different places, being five feet six inches. Their limbs slender, and playing badly and ungracefully. A very general bowing of the legs. Great numbers of girls and women walking lamely or awkwardly, with raised chests and spinal flexures. Nearly all have flat feet, accompanied with a down-tread, differing very widely from the elasticity of action in the foot and ankle, attendant upon perfect formation. But the overworking does not apply to children only; the adults are also overworked. The increased speed given to machinery within the last thirty years, has, in very many instances, doubled the labour of both. Changes in English society as a result of industrialization gave

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

rise to changes in government as well. The Reform Bill of The British Parliament in the early s was a far different institution than it has become. For generations, the Parliament in London included aristocrats and high church officials, sitting in the House of Lords , and wealthy, prominent citizens who sat in the House of Commons. Only people who owned a significant amount of property could vote in parliamentary elections for the House of Commons no one in the House of Lords was elected; everyone there either inherited a seat as an aristocrat, or became a member by virtue of his position in the Church of England , the official religion. The majority of people, including all women and working men without property, had no voice in government. And since members of the House of Commons often represented towns, rather than a specific number of people, changes in England over the centuries had created some odd situations. For example, centuries of land erosion had caused much of the coastal town of Dunwich to fall into the sea; its population in had fallen to thirty-two voters. Nevertheless, the town still sent a representative to Parliament, as it had for generations. On the other hand, Manchester, England, had become an important center of manufacturing, with sixty thousand residents. But Manchester had no representation in Parliament, since it was not a large town when the composition of Parliament had last been changed hundreds of years earlier. Small towns like Dunwich that still sent representatives despite their reduced size were called "rotten boroughs," a term that reflected another fact of British democracy: Since it was public knowledge how a person voted, voters could be and were bribed to vote for a particular person as a member of Parliament. In some cases, a single wealthy individual controlled Parliamentary representation by monitoring voters to make sure they voted as he had paid them to vote. In other instances, wealthy individuals, such as business owners, traveled to a rotten borough and in effect bought a seat in Parliament by bribing voters in a small town. By , the Industrial Revolution had created a new source of social and economic power: So it was not surprising that wealthy business owners wanted to share in political power as well. The major landmark of political change brought about by the Industrial Revolution was the Reform Bill of In November , the leader of the Whig party , an aristocrat named Charles, Earl Grey " , organized a campaign to make Parliament more representative of the population. Such a campaign arose from fears that the growing population of cities could lead to a violent revolution by desperate workers who had no voice in government, much like the French Revolution of During that conflict, mobs of workers, facing starvation, overthrew the king, executed aristocrats, and declared a republic a system of government in which there is no monarch and officials are elected by the people. The reform movement was opposed by the Conservative Party also called the Tories , whose parliamentary majority rested partly on Conservative representatives from rotten boroughs. In , despite Conservative opposition, the House of Commons passed a reform act that would give more people a vote and would send representatives to Parliament from cities like Manchester. But the House of Lords defeated the bill. In response, rioting broke out in several English cities. The Bishop of Exeter complained to the Prime Minister, the Duke of Wellington, that he did not feel safe coming to Bristol "an industrial city, like Manchester, without parliamentary representation" to consecrate a church, due to the threat of violence. Anger over being left out of representation was widely felt, and the bishop told Wellington he had heard of plans for a revolt against land owners among the poorest citizens. This report hardly came as news to the Duke of Wellington. His own house was attacked by a mob that broke thirty windows before it was disbursed by a servant firing a rifle from the roof. Four months later, the Reform Bill passed, on April 13, , giving industrial cities like Manchester and Liverpool representation in Parliament. But even so, British democracy was sharply limited. Only about 14 percent of British males were qualified to vote to qualify, a man had to own a minimum amount of property, which excluded most men who worked in factories. Women were not allowed to vote. Some members of Parliament represented fewer than three hundred people, while other members from urban districts such as Liverpool represented over eleven thousand. However limited in scope, the Reform Act of was a direct reflection of the widespread changes spurred by the Industrial Revolution. The growth of cities caused by industrialization put in sharp focus how outdated the English parliamentary system had become. And many citizens realized after the act was passed just how much more reform was needed. The Sadler Report Although the Reform Bill of failed to provide

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

factory workers with a vote or any political power, the conditions under which they worked and lived did become a political issue the following year. A member of the House of Commons, Michael Sadler “ held hearings in to highlight the working conditions of children in particular. Even though he lost an election and was no longer a member of Parliament, he published the results of his hearings in anyway. The published report included the testimony of child factory workers, who told of long hours, low pay, and dangerous working conditions, especially in textile mills. The Sadler Report caused a storm of public indignation. Some critics faulted him for asking leading questions phrased in a way to elicit the sort of answers he wanted to hear. And while some factories might have adopted more humane policies, many others were guilty of abusing children, just as Sadler documented. For decades afterward, the testimony of these young workers would be cited as an illustration of how greedy factory owners exploited children. The Factory Act of Lord Ashley Anthony Ashley Cooper, “, known as Lord Ashley until and later as the Earl of Shaftesbury was instrumental in persuading Parliament to pass the Factory Act of , which set standards for employment of children in textile factories and only in textile factories. The act required that children aged thirteen to eighteen could not be employed more than twelve hours a day, during which ninety minutes had to be allowed for meal breaks. Younger children, aged nine through twelve, could only work for nine hours a day, and no child could work between 8: This act was bitterly opposed by many factory owners, but other acts followed that imposed even more regulations on the working conditions in factories. The laws were passed to address business practices like those of Richard Arkwright “, who made an immense fortune by introducing machinery into textile manufacturing see Chapter 3. Workers in his factories worked eleven hours a day, from 6 a. About two-thirds of his employees were children, although Arkwright refused to employ five-year-olds, as some of his competitors did. He waited until children were six to put them to work eleven hours a day. On the other end of the age scale, Arkwright refused to employ anyone over the age of forty. Factory owners objected that the regulations Parliament passed trampled on their rights as free Englishmen to conduct their businesses as they saw fit, and also violated the rights of other free Englishmen, the workers, from agreeing to work as they chose. The Factory Act of opened a debate, which has never really ended, over the role of government in regulating economic activity. Robert Owen Robert Owen “, a self-made man and successful factory owner, was one of the earliest industrialists to recognize the need to reform the factory system. Owen was not interested just in making money. He was a member of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, which held meetings to discuss issues of the day, including the plight of workers employed in factories. He improved the housing provided to his workers, and he actively worked to combat alcoholism and spousal abuse among his employees. In Owen established the Institute for the Formation of Character, which provided daytime schooling for children from age two to ten, and offered classes at night for older children and for adults. And although some efforts were made in Parliament to pass laws limiting the length of the workday and requiring inspections of factories to make sure regulations were enforced, it took many years for even modest regulations to be passed by Parliament. In the meantime, Owen tried to take his ideas to the United States , where he hoped for a more welcome reception. But within four years the experiment fell into disarray. The community was overcrowded, and people who settled there could not agree among themselves on how to run the ventures.

Chapter 5 : The English Revolution by Christopher Hill

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Chapter 6 : What were the Intellectual Causes of French Revolution?

DOWNLOAD PDF SOME INTELLECTUAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

On its own, this book would be great, deserve five stars even, for its compelling evocation and tight argument about the 'intellectual consequences', broadly defined, of the English revolution.

Chapter 7 : UW Press - : Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution, Christopher Hill

EMBED (for calendrierdelascience.com hosted blogs and calendrierdelascience.com item tags).

Chapter 8 : English Revolution - Wikipedia

Some Intellectual Consequences of the English Revolution significantly falls short of the promise in its title. As Hill himself points out, the most influential results of the revolution originated in the failures of the revolutionaries.