OLIVER CROMWELL AND PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT, 1649-1658

*By Dr David L. Smith*

From the creation of the English Republic in 1649 until his death in 1658, Oliver Cromwell’s relationship with successive Parliaments was often troubled. It is one of the greatest ironies of Cromwell’s career that this figure, who played such a pivotal role in the Long Parliament’s campaigns against Charles I during the 1640s, should himself have found it so hard to form a stable and fruitful working relationship with Parliaments during the Interregnum. Whether or not it is appropriate to regard Cromwell as a champion of Parliaments remains a highly contentious question. When, in 1899, the former Liberal Prime Minister Lord Rosebery commissioned and funded a magnificent statue of Cromwell by Hamo Thorneycroft to be placed outside the Palace of Westminster, it had to be unveiled at a time when Parliament was not sitting for fear of hostile demonstrations. Why, it was asked, should someone so willing to purge or dissolve Parliaments be accorded such a place of honour beside the Houses of Parliament? Indeed, some might argue that with friends like Cromwell, did Parliaments have any need of enemies?[[1]](#endnote-1)

Part of the problem surely lies in the paradox that Cromwell appears to have believed in the importance of *a* Parliament within England’s constitutional arrangements, but he was never committed to any one Parliament. As he put it in October 1647 at the Putney Debates, he was not ‘wedded and glued’ to particular ‘forms of government’.[[2]](#endnote-2) Rather, he applied stringent criteria to Parliaments and had very high expectations of what he wished them to achieve. Cromwell’s letter to the Speaker of the Rump Parliament, William Lenthall, written the day after the battle of Dunbar, gives a good sense of his challenging agenda for Parliaments. Cromwell told Lenthall:

It is easy to say, the Lord has done this [meaning Cromwell’s victory over the Scots at Dunbar on 3 September 1650]. It would do you good to see and hear our poor foot going up and down making their boast of God. But, Sir, it is in your hands, and by these eminent mercies God puts it more into your hands, to give glory to Him; to improve your power, and His blessings, to His praise. We that serve you beg of you not to own us, but God alone; we pray you own His people more and more, for they are the chariots and horsemen of Israel. Disown yourselves, but own your authority, and improve it to curb the proud and insolent, such as would disturb the tranquillity of England, though under what specious pretences soever; relieve the oppressed, hear the groans of poor prisoners in England; be pleased to reform the abuses of all professions; and if there be any one that makes many poor to make a few rich, that suits not a Commonwealth.[[3]](#endnote-3)

Over the years that followed, however, Cromwell became ever more convinced that the Rump was falling short of these lofty ideals, and he grew ever more determined that it should put an end to its existence.

By the spring of 1653 he believed that he had secured the Rump’s agreement to dissolve itself, but then, on 20 April he heard that the Rump was planning immediate elections without measures to exclude those whom Cromwell regarded as ungodly. He therefore rushed to Parliament, accompanied by troops, and denounced the members as ‘whoremasters’ and ‘drunkard’. He told them that they had sat there too long for any good that they had been doing, and he ordered them to disperse.[[4]](#endnote-4) Two days later he published a declaration justifying this action in which he asserted that the Rump ‘would never answer those ends which God, His people, and the whole nation expected from them; but … this cause, which the Lord hath so greatly blessed and borne witness to, must needs languish … and, by degrees, be wholly lost; and the lives, liberties and comforts of His people delivered into their enemies’ hands.’ He insisted that there was ‘a duty incumbent upon us, who had so much of the power and presence of God going along with us, to consider of some more effectual means to secure the cause which the good people of this Commonwealth had been so long engaged in, and to establish righteousness and peace in these nations’.[[5]](#endnote-5) In Cromwell’s eyes, the Rump had failed to discharge its duty to God’s cause and God’s people, and it therefore deserved to be dissolved. Yet in so doing, Cromwell had exercised that quintessentially royal prerogative of choosing, at his own discretion, the moment when a Parliament should end. He had also used the threat of force against a sitting Parliament in a manner reminiscent of Charles I’s attempted arrest of five members of the Commons in January 1642. As Dorothy Osborne observed, ‘if Mr Pym were alive again I wonder what he would think of these proceedings, and whether this would appear as great a breach of the privilege of Parliament as the demanding [of] the five members.’[[6]](#endnote-6)

Following the dissolution of the Rump, Cromwell probably wielded more power than at any other stage of his career, in the sense that his options were more wide open than they ever were again. Yet those people, both at the time and since, who have seen Cromwell as greedy to concentrate power in his own hands have always found it difficult to explain his next move, which was to establish another kind of Parliament. He adopted a proposal from one of his Army colleagues, the Fifth Monarchist Major-General Thomas Harrison, for a nominated assembly of 140 godly individuals, based on the ancient Jewish Sanhedrin. Convinced that the Rump had betrayed the godly, Cromwell now tried to construct a Parliament consisting exclusively of the godly. One such was the splendidly named Praise-God Barebone, and for this reason the assembly has often been known as Barebone’s Parliament.[[7]](#endnote-7)

When Cromwell opened Barebone’s Parliament on 4 July 1653, he was full of optimism that this assembly would carry forward God’s purpose. His opening speech was one of Cromwell’s most exhilarated utterances. He declared: ‘Truly God hath called you to this work by, I think, as wonderful providences as ever passed upon the sons of men in so short a time. … It’s come, therefore, to you by the way of necessity; by the wise Providence of God … God hath owned you in the eyes of the world; and thus, by coming hither, you own Him.’ Cromwell urged the members to ‘consider the circumstances by which you are called hither; through what strivings, through what blood you are come hither, where neither you, nor I, nor no man living, three months ago, had a thought to have seen such a company taking upon them, or rather being called to take, the supreme authority of this nation! Therefore, own your call!’[[8]](#endnote-8) Yet Cromwell’s optimism soon turned to disappointment as the members of Barebone’s became deeply divided over which priorities to pursue. In December 1653 the assembly voted to dissolve itself and to surrender power back to Cromwell, who later described the whole episode as ‘a story of my own weakness and folly’.[[9]](#endnote-9)

At this point, Cromwell turned to another of his Army colleagues, Major-General John Lambert, who had been working for several weeks on a written constitution called the Instrument of Government. This constitution made Cromwell Lord Protector, and provided for government ‘by a single person and a Parliament’.[[10]](#endnote-10) Parliaments were to be elected triennially and to sit for a minimum of five months. Members had to be ‘persons of known integrity, fearing God, and of good conversation’.[[11]](#endnote-11) The Lord Protector and the Council were empowered to exclude any whom they believed to fail this test. The new constitution thus placed considerable weight on the relationship between Cromwell and Parliaments. That relationship continued to be problematic, however, and before long the familiar pattern – with Cromwell’s initial high hopes of a Parliament giving way to frustration and disappointment – re-established itself.[[12]](#endnote-12)

Once again, Cromwell displayed a visionary optimism when he opened the first Protectorate Parliament on 4 September 1654. He told members:

You are met here on the greatest occasion that, I believe, England ever saw; having upon your shoulders the interests of three great nations with the territories belonging to them; and truly, I believe I may say it without any hyperbole, you have upon your shoulders the interest of all the Christian people in the world … It’s one of the great ends of calling this Parliament that this ship of the Commonwealth may be brought into a safe harbour; which, I assure you, it will not well be, without your counsel and advice.[[13]](#endnote-13)

Unfortunately, things went wrong almost from the beginning. Members immediately began tinkering with the Instrument of Goverment, anxious especially to define the powers of the Protector and his Council more precisely, to reinforce the position of Parliament, and to restrain Cromwell’s desire to extend liberty of conscience. The latter was a particularly contentious point, for Cromwell cared passionately about it and included it as one of the four ‘fundamentals’ which he required members to accept on 12 September 1654 as a condition of their continuing to sit in Parliament. As he told them that day:

Liberty of conscience is a natural right; and he that would have it ought to give it, having liberty to settle what he likes for the public. Indeed, that hath been one of the vanities of our contest. Every sect saith, Oh! Give me liberty. But give him it, and to his power he will not yield it to anybody else. Where is our ingenuousness? Liberty of conscience – truly that’s a thing ought to be very reciprocal.[[14]](#endnote-14)

Yet many of the members, especially those of a Presbyterian persuasion, believed this to be a very dangerous principle which might unlock the spread of ‘damnable heresies’.[[15]](#endnote-15) On this issue, Cromwell was soon at odds with a significant number of members.

By the beginning of 1655, Cromwell had had enough and was determined to be rid of the Parliament at the first possible opportunity. The Instrument of Government stipulated that Parliaments could not be dissolved, except by their own consent, for at least five months, but it did not specify whether this meant five lunar months or five calendar months.[[16]](#endnote-16) Cromwell chose to interpret it as the shorter period, and after precisely fine lunar months, on 22 January 1655, he caught members unawares with a snap dissolution. He denounced them for obstructing the progress of liberty of conscience: ‘Is there not yet upon the spirits of men a strange itch? Nothing will satisfy them, unless they can put their finger upon their brethren’s consciences, to pinch them there … Is it ingenuous to ask liberty, and not to give it? What greater hypocrisy than for those who were oppressed by the Bishops to become the greatest oppressors themselves so soon as their yoke was removed?’ He lamented how they had missed opportunities – ‘the Lord hath done such things amongst us as have not been known in the world these thousand years, and yet notwithstanding is not owned by us’ – and he concluded: ‘I think it my duty to tell you that it is not for the profit of these nations, nor fit for the common and public good, for you to continue here any longer. And therefore I do declare unto you, that I do dissolve this Parliament.’[[17]](#endnote-17) This was Cromwellian rhetoric at its most devastating.

The first half of 1655 was a particularly difficult time for Cromwell. The dissolution of the first Protectorate Parliament was followed in March by a Royalist rising, Penruddock’s rebellion, in Wiltshire, and then in the early summer by severe setbacks in the Western Design, Cromwell’s campaign against Spanish power in the Caribbean. Faced with what he saw as these ‘late rebukes’ from God,[[18]](#endnote-18) Cromwell determined to embark on a more authoritarian solution and to impose what he called a ‘reformation of manners’ by military rule.[[19]](#endnote-19) In the late summer and autumn of 1655, England and Wales were divided into regions, each ruled by a Major-General who was instructed to ‘encourage and promote godliness and virtue, and discourage and discountenance all profaneness and ungodliness’ and ‘to enforce the laws against drunkenness, blaspheming and taking of the name of God in vain, by swearing and cursing, plays and interludes, and profaning the Lord’s Day, and such-like wickedness and abominations.’[[20]](#endnote-20) This was the Cromwell who wished to rule, as he had said back in July 1647, for the people’s ‘good, not what pleases them’.[[21]](#endnote-21)

The success of the Major-Generals’ drive for a ‘reformation of manners’ was patchy at best, and there was considerable resentment of this attempt at military rule and the Decimation Tax on former Royalists that was used to fund it.[[22]](#endnote-22) When the costs of his campaigns against Spain forced Cromwell to call a second Protectorate Parliament in the summer of 1656, the elections were dominated by cries of ‘no swordsmen! No decimators!’ The Parliament met amidst growing concerns that Cromwell was becoming more authoritarian. Before it assembled, he and the Council excluded just over a hundred elected members who were thought to be hostile to the Protectorate and to the Major-Generals.[[23]](#endnote-23) Members’ fears of the open-ended nature of Cromwell’s powers were only reinforced by the views that he expressed regarding the rule of law. In his opening speech on 17 September 1656 he declared: ‘If nothing should ever be done but what is according to law, the throat of the nation may be cut while we send for some to make a law. Therefore certainly it is a pitiful beastly notion to think that though it be for ordinary government to live by law and rule, yet … if a government in extraordinary circumstances go beyond the law even for self-preservation, it is yet to be clamoured at and blottered at.’[[24]](#endnote-24) Comments such as this led a growing number of civilian politicians – many of them lawyers like Bulstrode Whitelocke – to feel that Cromwell’s powers needed to be regulated more precisely. This was the political context that prompted the second Protectorate Parliament’s offer of the kingship to Cromwell.

It was, perhaps, the supreme irony of Cromwell’s career that he who had been so prominent in Parliament’s campaigns against Charles I, and who had been the third signatory on the King’s death warrant, should himself be offered the kingship. Yet Cromwell was never really a committed republican, and his hostility towards Charles I had always been much stronger than his hostility towards the monarchy itself. As early as November 1652, Cromwell had asked Whitelocke: ‘What if a man should take upon him to be king?’[[25]](#endnote-25) When it came, in February 1657, Parliament’s offer of the kingship placed Cromwell in a very difficult dilemma which it took him over two months to resolve.

That dilemma reflected the tensions between civilian politicians and Army leaders than ran throughout the Interregnum and that bedevilled the republic’s attempts to generate political stability. In relation to the kingship, civilians such as Whitelocke argued that it would place the regime on a secure constitutional footing and provide for the future succession. Against this, Cromwell’s Army colleagues were virtually unanimous in urging him to reject the offer, arguing that for him to become King would be to betray the cause for which they had fought, and for which so many of their comrades in arms had died or been maimed. In the end, it was this view that prevailed. Cromwell bowed to the Army’s wishes, probably not because he feared a mutiny but more likely because he regarded the Army as God’s instrument and interpreted its opposition to the kingship as a providential sign of God’s opposition. As Cromwell declared on 13 April 1657, ‘truly the Providence of God hath laid aside this title of King providentially de facto … God hath seemed providentially, seemed to appear as a Providence, not only to strike at the family but at the name … God hath seemed so to deal with the persons and with the family that He blasted the very title … I will not seek to set up that, that Providence hath destroyed, and laid in the dust; and I would not build Jericho again.’[[26]](#endnote-26) A few weeks later, on 8 May, Cromwell gave his definitive rejection of the kingship and under the terms of a new constitution, the Humble Petition and Advice, he remained Lord Protector, an office that he would continue to hold until his death in September the following year.

Although the bid to make Cromwell king had failed, the framers of the Humble Petition and Advice nevertheless succeeded in limiting Cromwell’s powers in certain key ways. In particular, the Humble Petition stipulated that ‘the ancient and undoubted liberties and privileges of Parliament’ were to ‘be preserved and maintained’, and that ‘those persons who are legally chosen by a free election of the people to serve in Parliament, may not be excluded from sitting in Parliament to do their duties, but by judgment and consent of that House whereof they are members’. With the case of the Quaker James Nayler fresh in people’s minds, the limits of liberty of conscience were defined more specifically than in the Instrument of Government to spell out that it did not extend ‘to popery or prelacy, or to the countenancing such who publish horrible blasphemies, or practise or hold forth licentiousness or profaneness under the profession of Christ’.[[27]](#endnote-27) The old mistrust between Cromwell and a significant number of members over the issue of liberty of conscience still persisted, and this clause was an attempt to satisfy as many different views as possible.

That mistrust was closely related to what was possibly the most intractable problem that Cromwell faced in his relations with Parliaments, namely how to reconcile his vision of England as a chosen people – like the people of Israel in the Old Testament – with the fact that those who enthusiastically embraced his vision remained a godly minority. Again and again he confronted this issue, and he insisted that it was possible to reconcile the interests of the godly and those of the whole nation. He felt that ‘the interest of Christians and the interest of the nation’ were not ‘inconsistent, or two different things’ and he pledged: ‘upon these two interests, if God shall account me worthy, I shall live and die.’[[28]](#endnote-28) He hoped that Parliament would play a crucial role in the process of tying those two interests together, and there were times when he believed they were succeeding, as for example on 21 April 1657 when he told parliamentary representatives that he thought they had ‘provided for the liberty of the people of God, and for the liberty of the nation. And I say he sings sweetly that sings a song of reconciliation betwixt these two interests! And it is a pitiful fancy, and wild and ignorant to think they are inconsistent. Certainly they may consist!’[[29]](#endnote-29) Yet in the end he was always disappointed, and that disappointment was never more apparent than in the second session of the second Protectorate Parliament which lasted for just two weeks in January and February 1658.

Cromwell’s speech at the opening of that session on 20 January 1658 showed that he still hoped he could work fruitfully with a Parliament, and his vision of England as an elect nation produced one of the most beautiful passages in all of his parliamentary speeches:

Truly I hope this is His land: and in some sense it may be given out that it is God’s land. And He that hath the weakest knowledge and the worst memory can easily tell that we are a redeemed people. We were a redeemed people, when first God was pleased to look favourably upon us, and to bring us out of the hands of Popery in that never-to-be-forgotten reformation, that most significant and greatest the nation hath felt or tasted.[[30]](#endnote-30)

Yet almost immediately Cromwell ran into problems. The Humble Petition and Advice had removed the power of the Lord Protector and the Council to exclude elected members, and this allowed many of those who had been so excluded in 1656 to return to Parliament. These included some highly articulate Commonwealthsmen, such as Sir Arthur Hesilrige and Thomas Scott, who had never been sympathetic to the Protectorate.

By this time there was a further bone of contention in the form of the second chamber, the ‘Other House’, which the Humble Petition and Advice had created. Jonathan Fitzgibbons discusses this in detail elsewhere in this issue of *Cromwelliana* and in his important new book.[[31]](#endnote-31) Here it is just worth noting that the ‘Other House’ proved to be another disappointment to Cromwell: only 42 of his 62 nominees actually accepted the invitation, and the creation of the second chamber both reduced his support in the Commons and antagonised those Commonwealthsmen to whom it seemed much too like the old House of Lords.[[32]](#endnote-32) A significant number of members of the Commons refused to recognise the ‘Other House’, and this sparked a passionate speech from Cromwell on 25 January 1658:

What is the general spirit of this nation? Is it not that each sect of people … may be uppermost? That every sort of men may get power into their hands? ... It were a happy thing if the nation would be content with rule. Content with rule, if it were but in civil things, and with those that would rule worst; because misrule is better than no rule, and an ill government, a bad one, is better than none … But we have an appetite to variety, to be not only making wounds but widening those already made, as if we should see one making wounds in a man’s side, and would desire nothing more than to be groping and grovelling in those wounds.[[33]](#endnote-33)

Even this extraordinary language failed to deflect the Commons away from the ‘Other House’ and onto Cromwell’s godly agenda. Barely a week later, on 4 February, he decided that he had had enough. He insisted that he had not sought power for himself: ‘I can say in the presence of God, in comparison with whom we are but like poor creeping ants upon the earth, I would have been glad to have lived under my woodside, to have kept a flock of sheep rather than undertaken such a government as this’. However, some of the members were ‘not to be satisfied’, and therefore: ‘I think it high time that an end be put to your sitting. And I do dissolve this Parliament! And let God be judge between you and me!’[[34]](#endnote-34) Whereupon, it was reported, ‘many of the Commons cried Amen’.[[35]](#endnote-35)

On that bitter note, Cromwell’s turbulent relationship with Parliaments drew to a close. In the end, he felt much cause for disappointment. He had hoped to work constructively with Parliaments and to use them to further his vision of England as an elect nation. Yet most members did not share his enthusiasm for extending liberty of conscience or for promoting a ‘reformation of manners’. To them, it mattered far more to protect the rule of law and to safeguard the rights and privileges of Parliament. At the heart of the problem lay the fact that although Cromwell was always committed to the principle of Parliaments, he was never committed to any individual Parliament. His eyes were always on the higher goal of protecting God’s cause and God’s people, and the moment he came to believe that any Parliament had ceased to pursue that goal he ruthlessly discarded it.

Cromwell’s relations with Parliament were therefore always complex and often very difficult. Whether he deserves to be praised as a champion of Parliaments will no doubt remain a controversial question. What can be said, in conclusion, is that Cromwell’s relations with Parliaments present the fascinating spectacle – one virtually unique in British history – of a republican Head of State attempting to work with Parliaments. Much of British political and constitutional history has been written in terms of Crown and Parliament, and the Interregnum affords the one opportunity we have to see how a non-royal ruler handled and interacted with a series of different Parliaments. For that reason – and despite all his frustrations and disappointments – this aspect of Cromwell’s career remains of commanding interest. It provides yet another reason why we should still care about him, and why he is still worth studying.
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