CHAPTER II

CONSOLIDATION OF THE STATE

ABSTRACT:

The organisation of the State in the Tudor period was consequent upon the wider sociological changes in society, occurring in the European mainland as well as in England. These social changes have been occurring over the centuries marked by expression of violence. The introduction of money by itself promotes this restructuring of society. In the 16th century this process acquires an acceleration, determining social relations and requiring an objectified State.

The debate centres upon whether the State is feudal or capitalist. Historians are agreed that it is a feudal state. We propose to examine how the state effects its mediatory role and organises power. In the process the state acquires a degree of autonomy from the various classes of society, as well as those constituents of the State system (Parliament of example), and those pressure groups in civil society, (Puritans, Roman Catholics, Humanists).
In England several attempts at centralisation in the middle ages is noticed. The period of feudal decadence was also a period in which the bourgeoisie struggles to constitute itself as a class. Burghers allied with the King. France and England both strove to centralise authority.

The state's mediatory role is seen to be more meaningful from the period of Tudor rule. In country, court and church, the traditional nobility is weakened by the direct intervention of the State. The more progressive element of this class was endowed with great opportunities and power. The nobility was maintained in their prestige with the clientage system. (The King was the highest patron).

The Henrician Reformation was intrinsic to the process of primitive accumulation.

The State was always quick to protest against the new forms of economic changes (enclosures, rent, prices, guilds, privateering etc.) on one hand, while conspiring with the bourgeoisie on the other. Its 'paternalism' (or independence) was resented by this section. Legislation made to professedly mollify an anguished peasantry.
The organisation of power from the medieval regionalism towards the central authority required the state executive to draw autocratic power upon itself. A decentralisation of power was also effected for the conducting of state in the 'national' form.

The State's international function was a concomitant to its acquiring 'sovereignty'. Personal issues to be suppressed by national ones, with international ramifications.

\textit{Tudor State was contemporaneous to the Absolute States of Europe, which were the political outcome of epochal changes in society, and in fact sealed the new modes of production and consequent relations of production that were occurring in Europe, while at the same time supporting the readjustment of older modes. By a long process of consolidation and centralisation, these states emerged over and above the cellular sovereignties of the middle ages. They took numerous forms in their multiple national organisations, consequent upon various regional discrepancies, but substantially they were the reorganisation of power of a flagging nobility towards the central monarch upon which a burgeoning bourgeoisie had its vested interest. This period of transition from the feudal to the capitalist era has engendered much debate as to}
the causes and the nature of this transition in society, and the consequent structural changes both in society and in the state.

We may refer to the celebrated Marxist debate on this topic by Professors Paul Sweezy and Maurice Dobb which still stands as the most representative exposition on the subject of this transition and the nature of the socio-economic system. To Dobb, the causes of feudal decay was the over exploitation of serfdom and therefore of a general exodus of the labour population from land. To Sweezy, the flight of serfs was due to causes external to feudalism, that is the lure of trade, and it was in fact the failure of the lords to over exploit their tenants. To Sweezy, the idea of the conflict of 'natural economy' with 'money economy' was an oversimplification and he attributes this transition to the discord of 'production for use' and 'production for exchange'. Dobb's contention was that trade being external to feudalism it only serves to accentuate the internal contradictions of the old mode of production.¹ This antinomy has been resolved by the effective

¹ Feudalism to Capitalism, Sanskriti Publication, p.17.
demonstration of urban trade as a mode of production accorded autonomy of structural practice by feudalism itself, thus making it as 'internal' to the older mode of production as the dissolution of manors.  

These premises therefore lead us to the second crucial question, that is the relations of production. Class domination is a concept central to Marxist theory of politics. The irreconcilable contradictions of these classes makes it crucial for the state to intervene in the affairs of society. Therefore the most fundamental characteristic of the state is that it is a means of class domination -- the ultimate sanctioning agency of this domination. The notion of the 'ruling class' is itself said to be 'problematic', for it may harbour interests other than the ruling. However the nature of the state regarding its leading personnel, the influence of the economically dominant class, and the structural compulsions of the mode of production...

---


production, constitute the Marxist answer to the question, why the state should be the instrument of the ruling class. Under the light of this summation the question may be posed: what was the class basis of the Tudor State?

Historians have come to the unequivocal conclusion that it (i.e. Absolute State) was the state of the feudal nobility. Sweezy had pronounced this system as neither feudal, nor capital, but a 'pre-capitalist commodity production system'. Christophar Hill in the same publication affirms that this deduction is logically untenable and goes on to conclude that the 'absolute monarchy is a different form of feudal monarchy from the feudal estates monarchy that preceded it but the ruling class remains the same, just as the republic, a constitutional monarchy and a fascist dictatorship can all be forms of the rule of the bourgeoisie'. Hill specifically comments upon the Tudor and the early Stuart state as 'essentially an executive institution of the feudal class more highly organised than before'.

4 Ibid., p. 73-4.
5 C. Hill, "Comment" in Sanskriti pub. op.cit. p. 75.
More recent scholarship continues to underpin the basis of this assumption. Thus Althusser states: 'The political regime of the absolute monarchy is only the new political form needed for the maintenance of feudal domination and exploitation in the period of developing of a commodity economy'.\(^7\) Anderson too leaves no room for doubt when he states emphatically: 'The Absolute State was never an arbiter between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, still less an instrument of the nascent bourgeoisie against the aristocracy; it was the new political carapace of a threatened nobility'.\(^8\)

However these conclusions are fraught with unease for Marx and Engels have on several occasions mentioned about the Absolute State as the condition for maintaining an equilibrium between the land-owning aristocracy and the bourgeoisie. In the Communist Manifesto itself the political role of the 'bourgeoisie' in the period of manufacture proper is characterised as 'serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact cornerstone of the great monarchies in general'.\(^9\) The State's role

---


\(^8\) Anderson, op. cit., p. 18.

\(^9\) For this discussion see Anderson, op. cit., p. 15-16.
of effecting a balance between these classes and even acting as the instrument of the bourgeoisie, as defined in these summations, always leaves room for debate. On another occasion Engels had stated: "by way of exception, however, periods occur where the warring classes balance each other so nearly that the State power, as ostensible mediator acquires, for the moment, a certain degree of independence of both. Such was the absolute monarchy of the 17th and 18th centuries, which held the balance between the nobility and the class of burghers'. It is to the historicity of this phenomenon that we turn in order to pursue how in the Tudor age state intervention was conducive to balancing between the various classes. This also poses the question of the comparative independence of the state, and we hope to come to a conclusion as to whether the Tudor State actually acquires this independence. This would require a comprehensive account of the organisation of state power which effects the state's alienation from civil society. One other point to note is that though we are concerned with the Elizabethan state it does not merit exposition in isolation, for the consolidation was a process which could be distinguished as meaningful from the period of ascension of Tudor monarchy. Here again a cursory glance at the history of the later middle

ages, occurring in the wide canvas of western Europe becomes necessary, to evaluate now the Tudor state became a necessity. This again raises the question whether the Tudor state, like its continental counterparts, was after all absolute.

I

With the development of productive forces, (money per se), medieval Europe was plunged into a turmoil under which the nobility and peasantry were both affected. The peasant bursts the bonds of servitude as rent takes the place of compulsory service. However land which was acquired previously by force or as gift, now becomes open to sale. The nobility, hard pressed for money, both to maintain its power and privilege, resorts to sale of land on the one hand, and to increased exploitation of peasants on the other.

Agricultural production in the old manor becomes more difficult and less profitable. The signeurial classes had to resign themselves to a large-scale shift of wealth and weakening of old authorities.11 As Holmes notes: 'Europe as a whole by

11 George Holmes, Europe Hierarchy and Revolt 1340 to 1450, Fontana, 1988, p. 172.
the mid fifteenth century was dotted and decayed, unworked, overgrown lands (like the lordship of the abbey of St Dennis) produced not by local administrative or political difficulties, but by a fundamental demographic movement which affected the whole continent. This demographic movement is acknowledged. However, we maintain that this movement follows the logic of the decadence of the old mode of production. In two substantial regions of Europe, Iberia and Eastern Europe, the nobility recovered and strengthened their position in the course of the fifteenth century. In large parts of Germany, east of the Elbe, and Slavonic Europe, the nobility retained their control over their lands and began in the latter fifteenth century to set up wide grain producing estates worked by serf labour. In 1412 the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order accepted the request of the Prussian nobility that peasants who fled from the lands of their lords should not be received in towns. The maximum wages for farm labourers was fixed. On the other hand, in North West Europe (western Germany, Northern France, Netherlands, England) the balance in wealth and power had shifted somewhat

12ibid., p. 130.

13ibid., p. 113.
down the social scale. Besides the town burghers, the well-
to-do peasants and rural craftsmen were the beneficiaries. Therefore, from the fifteenth century onwards Europe was to
develop upon two main lines of economic divisions, that of a
grain-producing East and industrial West.

The fourteenth century witnessed large scale social
distress, the most widespread and violent expression of which
occurred in France and England. Pressed by the demands of a
trading economy and the defiance of a straitened nobility,
the feudal over-lordship (kings) of these regions were to develop
with time into centralised despotism. However the English succe-
sors of William the Conqueror of Normandy were to be involved
in warfare with the French noble magnates on French soil in
what is known as the Hundred Years' war (1337 to 1453). The
'casus belli' of war was the claim to French royal title by
the English kings in the absence of an heir apparent. The
economic persuasion was chiefly the rich city of Flanders. This
prolonged warfare, disastrous to the peasantry in the form of
pillage and devastation, increased taxes and lower wages,
culminated in peasant uprisings in both countries - 'The
Jaquerie' (1358) movement in France and the uprising of Wat
Tyler (1381) in England. Though the French peasantry's rebellion was not as organised as the English uprising, they were both violent social upheavels, aimed at the seigniorial class and were the statement of a general crisis. Even if they were crushed and the nobility recovers its stability, the social and political pattern underwent prominent restructuring, with the traditional nobility gravely weakened.

The social unrest in England though occurring in a later chronological period, was symptomatic of the general crisis of medieval society and of the feudal nobility in particular. Slump in prices of grain, decreased wages, taxation for war, and especially the introduction of the poll tax, compounded by the Black Death (1348-1350), caused the English peasantry to revolt against their masters. Demands for disenfranchisement and reactions to the legal bonds of tenancy were expressed in the radicalism of the preacher John Ball, whose famous quip noted: 'when Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?'

The following graph shows the movement of prices and wages (between 1351 - 1325) in England.  

---

15 ibid., p. 113.
This violent resentment was not directed at the lay nobility alone and was in fact turned against the ecclesiastical feudal lords as the monastaries were often the target for peasant insurgency. The Church's opposition to dis-enservfment and peasant liberties can be noted for example in the Statute of Cluniac: "(We excommunicate) those who, holding away over serfs or bondmen, bondwomen or women of servile condition pertaining to the monastaries of our Order, grant to such persons letters and privileges of manumission and freedom". That was in 1320. One hundred and thirty-eight years later the
Cluniac still order that "those Abbots, Priors, Deans and other administrators of the Order, who have serfs and bondmen... must swear expressly that they will not manumit such serfs or their possessions".16

With the termination of the Hundred years' War, France experienced a centralisation of the state. At the crossroads of important trade routes, the French bourgeoisie, far advanced in trade and wealth, were in a position to supply the king with necessary funds for the maintenance of an army and officials of the central monarch. This was supplemented by a special annual tax (taille). The reign of Louis XI (1461-1483), saw the centralising process carried out with cunning and ruthlessness, as semi-independent seigneurial territories (Aquitaine, Normandy) were subordinated to the crown, whose authority was acknowledgedly absolute.

In England, the progenitors of the Norman conqueror, divided into the royal Houses of Lancaster and York, embarked upon a self-effacing war within itself, with the Crown as the

---

16 Leo Huberman, Men's Worldly Goods, New Delhi, Jan. 1989, p. 49.
prize none of contention. As noted earlier, by the fifteenth century, the financial resources of the nobility was gravely under pressure and the high English nobility saw the crown as the potential source of power, privilege and income. The crown in England had always entertained formidable power in its prerogative and several attempts had been made by the crown in the middle ages to consolidate its power and centralise government. However it was thwarted in this by the hereditary nobility. (This shall be given fuller treatment presently.) On the other hand, the crown was the recipient of larger rents as the biggest landlord in the country. With additional burger rents the crown was likely to have seen in a covetous position. The bourgeoisie in its confrontation with the aristocracy had always kept alive the concept of a national king and saw it advantageous to have the central monarch's power and privileges enhanced. The nobility became accustomed to viewing its titles as hereditary, which was actually an alien concept to early feudalism. And in fact this nobility determined kingship on an elective basis. 17 The political mysterism that was the

17 see R. Hauser, The Social History of Art, Vol.1, Vintage, 1985, p. 177. See also, Shakespeare's English Kings, Peter Saccio, OUP, 1976. Saccio has referred to the principle of inheritance by birth of the ruler. He has demonstrated that, given some dynastic justification, the number of other factors governing the right to the crown was unlimited, in the later feudal ages. According to Saccio, 'There was in the 13th century no written law governing inheritance of the crown, not even any established practice beyond the first principle that the eldest son of a king should succeed.' p. 10 to 11.
War of the Roses was therefore an assertion of rights to the throne on the principle of hereditary claims. It was to be the singular credit of Tudor government to establish heredity as the principal right upon which kingship was to be based and therefore to authoritatively settle their own dynastic succession.

This period of feudal seclusion was also the period in which the bourgeoisie makes its prolonged struggle to constitute itself as a class. That it would complete this achievement only with its political domination and the metamorphose of society itself, is of consequence to a period later than that of our immediate concern. However the path of this emancipation is fraught with violence at every step. The dissociation of Town and Country, of agriculture and craft and trade, of a conflict of interests on this basis itself was a vital factor in the disintegration of the feudal system. In the association of craftsmen and merchants into the brotherhood of guilds, chartered liberties were won from their feudal overlords after prolonged struggle. Here the burghers have allied with the king and kept alive the tradition of the central overlord as supreme, to whom feudal dues and homage were contractually bound. This early association was
never lost and from its early burgher stage to the later mercantilist era, the bourgeoisie provided the vantage ground for the monarchy to find its footing to raise itself to its position of absolutism. The richer burghers of the middle ages went on to form a 'money aristocracy' of the town, a counterpart to the 'crown aristocracy' of the country. Corporate property, involving chiefly labour of the individual, and to that extent 'estate capital', organised in the form of craft guilds, indulged in a rough equalitarianism. However the constituents of this organisation was to split apart giving rise to rich burghers on the one hand and the apprentices with the rabble or fugitive population from the country on the other. In similar vein the rich merchants had to shake off the shackles of guilds as they prove to be restrictive to industry. Therefore the towns like the country witnessed its share of social upheavals in the 14th century. Revolt of the Ciompi in Florence (1378), Rising of the weavers at Utrecht and Ghent (1379-82), Rising of Maillotins at Paris (1382) are some of the outstanding examples. The onslaught of marauding

---

16 The merchant guilds joined into hanse or leagues of which the Hanseatic League of Germany is the famous example. Spread from Holland to Russia, this Union of Henses was a powerful organisation, stretching its trading monopoly over more than hundred towns, creating its own legal and administrative system, protected by its own force, a state in itself, and controlling the trades of Northern Europe with the rest of the world. (Moersman, op. cit., p. 36).

19 see Holmes, op. cit., p. 128-33.
troops unpaid and let loose upon town and country, compounded the problems of the bourgeoisie and it was to the central ruler that appeal was made. As noted earlier, it was only towards the end of the 15th century and in the 16th and 17th centuries that this would become effective. Medieval Europe at this time was besotted with weak rulers and endemic conflicts. Personal failings and a general crisis of the monarchy was a common feature; the prolonged sickness of the French monarchy during the English invasion, the collapse of royal authority in the early part of the Wars of the Roses in England, impotence of the Spanish monarchies in the reigns of Henry IV and John II, the disintegration of Luxemburg–Hapsburg power in central Europe. 20

Inspite of this, both French and English monarchs had striven to centralise authority (of which more later) and advanced the interest of the bourgeoisie. France had managed the annual tax (taille) on a national basis and its central authority was heading towards an absolutism. A statute of 1439 read in this manner:

To obviate and remedy and put an end to the great excesses and pillagings done and committed by the armed bands, who have

---

20 Holmes, op.cit., p. 239.
long-lived and are still living on the people.... the king prohibits all, on pain of being gared less - majeste ....... and deprived for ever, he and his posterity, of all public honours and offices, and of the rights and prerogatives of the nobility, and the confiscation of his person and possessions, that no one of whatever estate he may be, may.. raise, conduct, lead or receive a company of men-at-arms... without leave, license, and consent and Ordinance of the King ...

On the same penalty, the King prohibits all Captains and men of war that they shall not take merchants, workmen, cattle, nor horses, nor other beasts of burden, whether in the field or in carriages, and shall not trouble them, nor the carriages, goods and merchandise which they are carrying, and shall not hold them to ransom in any manner; but shall suffer them to labour, and to come and go, and carry their goods and merchandise in peace and safety, without asking any of them, or hindering or disturbing them in any way. 21

The French king's sharp orders issuing from his personal authority was directed at the corporate dwellers as well ;

21 Huberman, op.cit., p. 75-6.
Charles by the Grace of God King of France... after many deliberation of our Great Council... have ordained and ordained... that our said town of Paris, thence shall from henceforth be no masters of metiers or communalities whatsoever... But we wish and ordain that in every metier there shall be chosen by our said Provost... certain idlers of the said metier... and from henceforth they are forbidden to hold any assembly as a craft fraternity or otherwise... unless it be with our consent, leave and license... or the consent of our provost... on pain of being treated as rebels and disobedient to us and to our Crown of France, and to lose person and possessions.22

In England, during the Middle Ages this centralising process experienced several serious attempts at advancement followed by debilitating setbacks. What is evident is that the King in England was called upon to balance the powers more evenly and specify his support base, as well as rely on a decentralised officialdom. One of the Statutes of the Realm of England in 1436 reads:

22 Huberman op.cit., p. 77.
Whereas the Masters Wardens and the people of (the) Guilds Fraternities, and other companies incorporate... make themselves many unlawful and unreasonable ordinances ...... whereof the Cognisance, punishment and correction all only pertaineth to the King.......The same our Lord the King by the Advise and Assent of the Lords spiritual and temporal and at the prayer of the commons aforesaid, hath ordained by Authority of the Parliament, that the Masters, Wardens and people of every such Guild, Fraternity or company incorporate... shall bring... all their Letters patent and Charters to be registered of Record before the justices of the peace... and moreover hath ordained and defended by the Authority aforesaid, that from henceforth no such Masters, Wardens, nor people make nor use no ordinance if it be not first discussed and approved for good and reasonable by the justices of peace.23

However, the general crisis of the monarchy was a phenomenon characteristic of this period and that eventually the monarchy seeks to find its bearings with a reinvigorated discipline is a feature of expediency, not of chance. As

23 Huberman, op.cit., p. 77.
mentioned earlier the later 15th century witnessed the comparative settling down of the turbidity of the earlier years with the East/West divide having taken root. Western Europe saw the emergence of strong monarchies. Louis XI in France (1461) Ferdinand and Isabella of Castille and Aragon (after 1469), Frederick III of Germany and Albert Achilles of Brandenburg (1471-86) were the princely executives of a new form of State, national in organisation, competitive in relation with other nations, warring not for feudal domination but rather for protection of trade and colonial domination, and in the materialist sphere supporting the steady transformation of estate capital to moveable capital.

In a summary analysis we have so far tried to enumerate the materialist basis of the restructuring of European society of the late middle ages. Though we concern ourselves with the English (Tudor) state, the occurrence of the nation state in Europe is of crucial significance to our thesis, for they define the transformation from the medieval to modern political institutions. We do not pretend to analyse those states in any way, however, they serve at times to highlight the English state of this transitory period. To that end, France has been of special interest in the above analysis.
(i) State as Mediator

Henry Tudor's (1485-1509) victorious march from Leicestershire to London on 22nd August 1485, after having successfully contested for the crown in the field of Bosworth, was to usher in an era of Tudor despotism and comparative respite for the crown.\(^ {24} \) The houses of Lancaster and York embroiled in bloody feuds and drawing the high nobility into the fray were to annihilate itself, and hierarchy finds itself unbalanced as its unquestioned dominance is redefined by the mediation of the state, more precisely by the Tudor kings.

How the state makes this effective, and acquires a degree of independence, and how the various classes of society are professedly kept in balance, are the questions and concerns of this section. With the empirical evidence in hand, that is historical scholarship, we make an attempt to describe this process of mediation to which we had referred in the early part of this chapter.

In a comprehensive work, Lawrence Stone describes the

\(^ {24} \) For thirty years Englishmen were the spectators of a rigmarole when the crown changed its seat five times. In 1461 Henry VI lost to Edward IV, in 1470 Edward lost to the King-maker Warwick and Henry VI was restored. Eight months later Edward came back to the throne; Richard III succeeded him in 1483 to be divested of power by Henry Tudor (VII) in 1485.
environment of the elite (mainly of 1558-1641) and demonstrates the cause of a crisis in their affairs which was to affect political institutions in England. Stone notes that, "the early Tudors has striven, not without success, to undermine the strength of the nobility which they regarded as a menace to quasi-absolute monarchy. This proposition may be demonstrated by the facts of Tudor rule. Henry VII's ascension to the throne was accompanied by several pertinent measures that the young ruler undertook with rapid strokes. What he did was, (i) legitimised his ascension in Parliament, and through marriage with Elizabeth of York, (ii) restored effective royal power, and (iii) by means of certain significant innovations fundamentally strengthened the office of kingship.

Henry's task of retaining the crown involved the extermination of all real and potential threats in the form of Yorkists claimants to the throne, till the last drop of doubtful royal blood had been suppressed. To the potential


26 Edward IV's own sons had been bastardized and murdered by Richard III. Heirs apparent were his five daughters of whom Elizabeth (Henry's Queen) was the first in line, and Richard III's nephews Warwick and Lincoln in that order.
threats from the feminine order comparatively mild treatment was meted. The dowager duchess of Burgundy was transferred to the nunnery for her political waywardness, the sisters of Elizabeth were given away in 'dependable' marriages. Warwick languished in the Tower for fourteen years before the axe fell on him in the Tower Green after due state trial. Lincoln, Earl of Suffolk, was killed in the battle of Stoke (1487), whose complicity with the impersonator Simnel (as Warwick) had brought about a very critical alliance of this last of the factious nobles. The impersonation of Perkin Warbeck as one of Edward IV's son was an even more dangerous enterprise. An England divided within itself was a target of those continental rulers who supported the duplicity (France, Netherlands the Empire, Ireland and Scotland). Besides a beleaguered Henry had to curb the Cornishmen who once supported Warbeck. The mild detention of Warbeck in the Tower became the occasion of further intrigue between Warbeck and Warwick, for which Warwick as the more potent threat had to forfeit his life. Next to go to the scaffold were Lincoln's brothers Suffolk, William, and cousin Courtenay. Henry did not spare even William Stanley who was regarded to have won Bosworth for him. 27

Extermination, confiscation of lands, diminished inheritance, reduced ranks and forfeiture of titles broke the back of the factious nobility. In government organisation Henry overhauled the strongholds of the overmighty lords, took stern measures to disband private armies of retainers, to stop juries from being browbeaten and to protect tenure, contract, and public order through special courts directly answerable to the crown. In this Henry enlisted the support of the lesser nobility and of those newly created peers, placed in key positions and working in the interest of the country rather than of a clique.

Even as hierarchy was buttressed, social mobility was becoming increasingly persistent. Entrance into the peerage, whose status was entrusted with legality by the monarch was also subsequent upon the acquisition of a considerable quantity of land. Henry VII in attempting to balance the governmental institutions and enforce subservience to the central authority, promoted members of the lower peerage to positions of prominence and enlisted the support of new men but refused to create new peers. Stone points out that the first and most far reaching efforts to mould society by legislation were the clauses in the first draft of the Statute of Uses of 1529, by which the lands of the nobility were to be made inalienable in perpetuity,
thus freezing the structure of aristocratic land-tenure at its 1529 level. This was an effort where national legislation, rather than feudal settlements made by warfare was to determine the possession of land. For the next forty years King, Parliament and Privy Council continued in the efforts to draw up legislation, to prevent land from being opened to sale to rich merchants.28

With Henry VIII's sale of monastic lands this policy was reversed. Between 1509-1553 some forty-seven titles had been created, restored, or resumed in the peerage group. They formed the new administrative and military elite. With Elizabeth there was again a halt in this sphere of activity, for the Queen was tight-fisted about creating new peers as well as endowing knighthoods. The reason was acknowledgedly not to reduce the powers of the nobility through numbers but to retain the peerage as a caste for men of ancient lineage.29

The "inflation of honours" was statistically highest in the court of James in the early years of his reign. There

---
28Stone, op.cit., p. 27-8.
29Stone, op.cit., p. 97.
was an increase of about 56% of peerage between 1615 - 28, an indication of an highly charged activity in the form of struggle for ranks and titles in this period. Here a corrupt court and officials of the monarchy receiving perquisites in the form of resale of monopolies, offices and favours, also wrenched from the crown the authority for the lucrative practice of selling knighthoods.\(^{30}\) (A sale of not less than £ 60,000/- is recorded in the period of James' rule). However though Elizabeth's reign saw a confinement in the creation of new peers it was yet a period when the sale of aristocratic land was the highest. Inflationary prices drove the nobility into selling lands in alarming quantity, (the period from 1585 - 1506 being the period of highest sales) that this phenomenon has been termed a financial 'crisis' of the aristocracy.\(^{31}\) For the feudal nobility there was a 35% loss of manors to the gentry between 1558-1641 as compared to 1435-1547. It was therefore wise policy on the part of Elizabeth to constrict the creation of new peers. As things stood, the decay of feudal modes, inability to adapt to a capitalist economy, adoption of

\(^{30}\)Stone, op.cit., p. 81; 127.

\(^{31}\)Stone, op.cit. p. 158.
a transaction in which land was a saleable commodity, and
in the ideological sphere, moral objections to dismemberment
of family patrimony being diluted, the old landed aristocracy
was definitely on the decline.

Feudal decadence was however given the most consequential
blow by the Henerician Reformation. The implications of this
State-initiated movement goes deep and therefore merits a
wider analysis. Here we note that the ecclesiastical nobility,
under the aegis of the Roman Pope was dislodged from its position
of power in Parliament and though bishops continued in their
office, their allegiance and fiscal dues were statutorily bound
to the national crown. The Parliamentary statutes of Henry VIII
did not lose their potency and when Mary Tudor attempted to
revive Papal power and restore Church lands, Parliament would
not concede or rescind former enforcements. 32

We have so far chronicled the state's instrumentation
of the landed classes both in terms of power, privilege, and
landed wealth. Regression in the nobility's power and wealth

32Bindoff, op. cit., p. 163.
had seen a proportionate advancement of the monied classes, the gentry in the country as well as the burghers in the towns. The prestige that land carried with it had been one of the chief lure for the scramble for titles for the gentry. What we have discovered so far was that while Henry VII declined to create new peers, Henry VIII was crucially bound to do so and also to sell lands. With Elizabeth there is again an attempt at balancing the entry into the peerage, though the transaction of land was conducted with great urgency. The clientage system which continued upto James' reign, both locally and in the centre, supplemented by the possession of land and therefore of a tenancy, were the status imperative of the feudal nobility. In this aspect the nobility received protection by the crown.

The Church in the meanwhile deprived of its foothold in England, was seen to reanimate itself with Mary Tudor's compliance and made several forays into the bastion of the State during Elizabeth's reign. The Jesuit mission was the most determined counter attack by the Papacy. At the same time Mary Queen of scots served as the centre of a ring around which Papal plots continued to alarm the English State. The Ridolfi plot was foiled in 1571. The Duke of Norfolk was executed (1572) and Mary herself spared so long as a sister
monarch, was executed in 1587. Thus the last of the factious nobility, who were assisted by the Roman Pope, was brought to an end.

The clash of interest in society was beginning to express itself in the Elizabethan court where conservative elements plotted to retract all that the establishment had achieved in new modes of enterprise and economic and political ventures. The peerage who was encouraged by Elizabeth to lend its lustre to court as well as to pick up the spoils of trade and commerce, was distinct from the gentry who was engaged in war or in the administration of the country. This peerage had begun to exploit the capitalistic possibilities of their estate, turned eagerly to joint stock enterprise, urban development and mining speculations. It was the fusion of "old blood, new wealth, and political careerism".\(^{33}\) Opposed to this was the conservative element, constituting expressly the cabal around Mary, whose plots had wider ramifications in that they sought to bring about social and political revolution. Intent upon recognizing Mary as the successor to Elizabeth, resuming friendship with Spain by surrendering

treasure and property, and withdrawing assistance from the Huguenots in France, their intentions were to reverse all that was achieved by the progressive peerage. Opposed to Cecil and his faction, the group of Throckmorton, the Northern Catholic tribe, Northumberland, Westmoreland, Dacres et al., aimed at restoring Catholicism, Papal supremacy and obtaining foreign aid, and targeted for the eventual deposition of Elizabeth. 34 We have noted that they have been exterminated by the Elizabethan regime. Indeed in the Elizabethan Court it was the power wielders and favourites who advanced political careerism and reaped fortunes. Illustrative of this is the group of Cecil, Leicester and Elizabeth herself, who were party to the expeditions of Drake, or Essex and other favourites who were the monopoly traders of precious commodities. 35

Thus the Tudor State had weakened the traditional nobility to an extent, (in country, court and in church) while creating opportunities and rendering power to the more progressive element of this class. The state of course did not presume to upturn feudal modes of production and related class relations,

35 See Neale, ibid., p. 90-4.
but it was at the same time encouraging primitive accumulation that would usher in capitalism proper. We therefore turn to the activity of mediation that the state was conducting in order to view how the bourgeoisie was affected.

If Henry VII had weakened the old feudal power with its centrifugal processes, Henry VIII gave it a harder knock through the Reformation of the church. The beneficiaries of land endowments made from the dissolution of monasteries and confiscations of church lands were the gentry and the 'new men' or lesser gentry. As Christopher Hill points out, "The dissolution of the monasteries takes its place beside the Statute of Liveries in reducing the social influence of the old aristocracy". 36

The momentous changes brought in by the Henerician Reformation was that (i) large quantities of land passed on for sale into the market and the men of property benefitted from the dissolution. 37 The landed classes in the country (barring the rebellious members of that class) and the influential peers at Court contrived to use the crown as the

37 ibid., p. 45.
funnel through which the wealth of the Church was drained into the pockets of courtiers. However the land was resold and by the end of the century it had come into the possession of gentleman and monied men of the towns. (ii) it brought lands into the hands of monied men who were predisposed to enterprise upon land critically different from the mode of production present to feudalism. Enclosures, pasture farming of arable land and rackrenting was in practice long before the Reformation. The first detailed account of enclosures had been written by a chantry priest in Warwickshire soon after 1460. Churchmen had been engaged in browbeating tenants no less than lay peers. However the rapid transference of great masses of property augmented rural distress, and sparked into acceleration the forces of capitalism. In other words great masses of dispossessed landless labour power were thrown into the capitalist market, and (iii) it consequently accelerated the growth of manufacture which was already in progress on a

---

38Tawney, op. cit., p. 138.
small scale, it reduced the power and privilege of the clergy by statute.

Under the changing conception of respective rights of lords and peasants it was no longer to the interest of the lord to bind the customary tenant to the manor, and instead of using seigneurial rights to arrest runaways, the lord was finding every possible legal and illegal means to evict the tenant. To these landowners the restraint of crown in the form of statutes, and violent upheavals from below, were resisted with resilience till these forces were to erupt in the civil war of 1640.

The widespread social distress in the lower reaches of society was viewed with articulate protest by a section of the bourgeoisie. The transfer of land was seen to be the cause of such a malaise. But this Humanist reaction was drowned with

---

39 Christopher Hill notes: 'For one William Stumpe who converted Malmesbury Abbey into a factory, there were no doubt scores of Eliota and Cromwells and Fairfaxes who turned abbeys into country houses; and the Corporation of Lynn was equally exceptional in transforming an inappropriate church into a factory. But the important thing for our purpose is the exception, the new tendency. Glastonbury Abbey became a worsted manufactory Rotherham College a malt-house. At Grimaby a friary was turned into a storehouse. In London, glass factories were established at the Black, White and Crutched Friars, a storehouse at Greyfriars and at the Priory of St John of Jerusalem; New Abbey, East Smithfield became a biscuit factory and a storehouse; the Minorites was converted into an armoury and workhouses. Immigrants settled in vacated monastic sites; Stowe dated the expansion of the City's population from the expulsion of monks. The Marian exiles brought back new industrial techniques. (op.cit. p.48-9).
disdain by the State; as Thomas More was to lose his head and the protector Somerset's (1547-9) fall from office and consequent forfeiture of life, was the outcome of his attempted social reforms. When the government made a bid to act against depopulation it was either flaunted or resisted. Thus the Royal Commission set up at the instance of the "Commonwealth men" was strongly objected with the plea that the peasants would rise in revolt, as in the case of Germany, if they were not violently suppressed. For the Elizabethan era this protest was to gradually penetrate even the House of Commons, as expostulations urging free-speech and free-trade was made (More and Wentworth's case). Therefore Government was forced to concede by 1597, that land was to be

40 For Somerset's reign and his policies that antagonized vested interests see Bindoff op. cit. p. 150-9.

41 The humanist More had protested: "When I consider and weigh in my mind all these Commonwealths, which now a days everywhere do flourish, so God help me, I can perceive nothing but a certain conspiracy of rich men, procuring their own commodities under the name and title of the Commonwealth." (Utopia II,9) The idealistic pacifism of Starkey was expressed thus: "There is a perfect civility there is the true commonweal, where as all the parts, as members of one body, be knit together in perfect love and unity, every one doing his office and duty, after such manner that, whatsoever state, office or degree any man be of, the duty pertaining with all diligence be busily fulfilled and without envy or malice to others accomplish the same. And so thus, when every part after this manner doeth his office and duty.... with perfect love and amity one to another one glad to succour and aid another as members and parts of one body, to the intent that after this worldly and civil life here peaceably passed and virtuously spent, they may at the last all together attain such end and felicity as by the goodness of God and ordinariness of nature, is determined to the excellent dignity and nature of man. Then shall there be established and set in such a multitude of people so governed, so ruled with such policy, that thing which we have so long sought, that is to say a very and true commonweal" (Dialogue p. 141).

42 Taunton op. cit. p. 145.
laid down to pasture for the explicit purpose of giving it a rest. 43

If the state was instrumental in unleashing the forces of capitalism it was also incumbent upon it to pacify the voices of protest expressive of the inherent contradictions of these deterministic relations. The various Statutes that the successive governments formulated were in order to mollify the explosive peasantry. Flaunted by landowners, these regulations were to eventually force the vagabond population into submission to industry and wage labour. Listed below are some of the important economic legislation that the state declared. They illustrate the urgency of the situation, the state's mediatory role, but also testify that these productive forces now released and the social relations thus gendered, in no way could be withdrawn or obstructed in their advancement.

Summary of the Important Agricultural Legislation:

1488 4 Hen. VII c. 16; An act against engrossing (i.e. the consolidation of several holdings to the detriment of neighbours) in the

43 Tauney, op. cit., p. 178.
Isle of Wight. This was an important strategic area, and the military ill-effects of depopulation here were stressed.

1489 4 Hen. VII c 19: A general Act against depopulation which claimed that in certain areas where 200 people had previously been employed there now remained only two or three herdsmen. The Act ordered all occupants of 20 acres upwards of land which had been tilled in the past three years to maintain that land in tillage on pain of forfeiting half the profits to the lord of the manor.

1515 6 Hen. VIII c 5: An Act specifically ordering the reconversion of pasture land to arable, and the rebuilding of decayed houses.

1516 7 Hen. VIII c. 1: An Act applying only to parishes where most of the land used to be tilled and ordering that if such land had been converted it was to be reconverted and the population were to return.

In 1517 the 'first enclosure commission' was set up by Wolsey. It was ordered to enquire into what land had been converted to pasture since 1488 and what village had decayed in consequence. A number of cases of breaches of statutes
were brought before the courts and offenders were compelled to enter recognizances to destroy their hedges.

1526 Proclamation ordering that all land enclosed and converted since 1488 be restored to tillage.

1528 Proclamation requiring men to disclose to the Lord Chancellor the names of such persons as do enclose any grounds or pastures to the hurt of the commonwealth.

1529 Proclamation ordering anyone who enclosed land contrary to government legislation to destroy the hedges and ditches they made.

1533-4 25 Hen. VIII c 13; An Act forbidding any man to keep more than 2000 sheep or to hold more than two farms unless they were in the parish in which he lived.

1536 27 Hen. VIII c 22; An Act referring to that of 1489 and enacting that the King would be entitled to receive half the profits from those lands not yet reconverted.

1536 27 Hen. VIII c 28; An Act requiring all those to whom monastic land had been granted to maintain the land which had been
tilled in the past 20 years as arable land.

In 1548 a second enclosure commission was appointed but it did not complete its work. It was to enquire into what villages or hamlets had decayed as a result of enclosure, how many persons kept 2000 sheep or more, what common land had been seized into private hands and whether recipients of monastic lands had maintained those lands in cultivation.

1552 5 & 6 Edw. VI c. 5 ; An Act introducing a permanent body of commissioners to search out offenders against the enclosure acts.

1556-5 2 & 3 Ph. and M c. 2 ; An Act confirming that of 1489 and making it applicable to all houses with 20 acres of land.

1563 5 Elix. c 2 ; An Act confirming statutes passed under Henry VII and Henry VIII and enacting that all land which have been farmed for the space of four years since 1528 was to remain in tillage, and that no land currently tilled was to be converted.

1569 Proclamation warning that the statutes concerning enclosures were to be obeyed and that the government will proceed severely against offenders.
1539 35 Eliz. c. 7. An Act which, on the ground that sufficient land was now in tillage, repealed the clause in the Act of 1563 concerning conversion to pasture.

1597 39 Eliz. c. 1. An Act ordering all houses of husbandry which had decayed in the past seven years to be rebuilt, as well as half of those which had decayed in the previous seven years. 44

Summary of the main legislations of the Poor Law:

1495 II Hen. VII c. 2. An Act ordering local officials to set vagabonds or idle persons in the stocks and then to eject them. All beggars were to return to their own hundreds and beg there.

1531 22 Hen. VIII c. 12. An Act ordering J.P.'s to search out for the impotent poor in their districts and give them letters authorising them to beg within certain limits. Any beggar who begged outside the specified area or without a license was to be put in the stocks. This Act set a precedent by the making the J.P. responsible for its enforcement.

---

1536 27 Hen. VIII c 25

An Act ordering the authorities of parishes to 'charitably receive' beggars and retire them with voluntary alms. Alms were to be collected every Sunday and preachers were to exhort liberality. Vagrant children between the ages of 5 and 14 years were to be apprenticed.

1547 I Edu. VI c. 3; A particularly severe Act providing that a sturdy beggar might be made a slave for two years, and if he ran away, a slave for life (This clause was repealed in 1549) The Act also laid down that cottage were to be erected for the impotent poor.

1563 5 Eliz. c. 3; An Act charging that if a person refused to give alms after being exhorted by the Bishop, he could be bound by £10 to appear before the J.P.s. If he still refused they were empowered to imprison him.

This Act was a first step towards a compulsory poor rate, but as yet care was taken to make contributions as voluntary as possible, and only to resort to force when persuasion was quite ineffectual.

1572 14 Eliz. c 5; This was an important codification of the law which ran heavily against the 'professional poor' as it provided very severe penalties for vagrants. The impotent and
aged however were to have relief arranged in their home parish. The J.P.'s were ordered to make their own register of all the names of their local poor, to find habitations for them. To do this they were to estimate the cost and then to assess and tax all the parish inhabitants accordingly.

1576 18 Eliz. c. 3: An Act supplementing that of 1572 with the extremely important order that a stock of wool, flax, hemp, iron or other stuff was to be provided in every city and corporate town, and every market town where it was thought by the J.P.'s to be necessary to enable the able-bodied poor to work. Houses of correction were to be built in every county and those who refused to work were to be sent there.

This was the first expression in government legislation of the realisation that employment was not necessarily due to the wickedness and idleness of men, and that to provide work for the able-bodied poor was a positive and practical approach to the problem.

1598 39 Eliz. c. 3: This was the most comprehensive statute, and one which remained in force until 1834. It placed, the responsibility for poor relief in the hands of four overseers
of the poor, to be chosen every Easter by J.P.'s. They were to set children to work as apprentices, to provide the adult unemployed with work, and to relieve the aged and infirm, for which they were empowered to build hospitals. The funds for their work were to be raised by a compulsory rate on every individual and could be raised by distress i.e. by seizing goods. The assessment were to be made by parochial officers, and wealthier parishes were expected to aid poorer ones.

1598 39 Eliz c 4: An Act empowering J.P.'s to take measures for houses of correction for rogues and vagabonds. Earlier statutes providing for punishment were repealed; rogues were now to be whipped and then returned to their parish or placed in a house of correction. 45

What transpires is that the agricultural legislation seeks to remedy the situation engendered for the poor, while in fact, the renewal of this Act (35 Eliz, c. 7) in 1593 testify that the situation was not redeemed by governmental fiat, nor was logically meant to. Poor laws, were in fact

45ibid., p. 182-4.
penal measures, and only warranted the wage contract through compulsory work for the poor, and apprenticeship for children. At the logical extreme the harshness of the situation is sought to be placated through charitable organisations and relief funds. The acuteness of the distressing situation and the government's solicitude is more apparent in the reign of Elizabeth. The charity institutions (Bridewell, Bedlam) are proffered to alleviate the situation but they symbolised the irretrievable contradictions that the regime made no pretensions to eliminate, but only to assuage.

We have already noted how throughout the middle ages, the bourgeoisie had striven to extricate itself from the restrictive confines of the guild system and how this path was fraught with violence. In the sixteenth century this process was not complete, and the government's positive role can be deciphered from the legislations connected with this liberating process.

On the other hand, the paternalistic State showed growing concern at the exodus of industry into the countryside. Without the proper apprenticeship that guilds offered, though bent upon large-scale production at the cost of quality, this growth of the manufacturing system could not be detered. The
state's legislation met with little success. The legislation on wages also denote the government's efforts to regulate the interest of all classes in society, however ineffective they ultimately were.

The Tudor age gives evidence of this growing pressure in the form of violent uprisings: The Pilgrimage of Grace (1536) Ket's Rebellion (1549) The Risings of the North (1569) Essex's Rebellion (1603) are the conspicuous examples. The State applied all its ruthless powers in suppressing these revolts.

State protectionism in trade (especially in cloth) was matched by protection of corporative industries of towns. However the Court aristocracy and especially the Queen's favourites continued to win trade privileges, customs farms, monopolies, revenue forms etc. and amass unprecedented sums of wealth. These courtiers also aportioned licenses for forming joint-stock companies in which the state too had a share or

46 The Act of 1557 (4 & 5 Ph & M c.5) tried to restrict manufacture of certain cloth outside corporate or market towns there manufacture had carried on for the last ten years. However by the Act of 1559 1 Eliz c.9, and again by the Act of 1576-16 Eliz. c. 16 certain areas (Essex, Wilshire, Somerset, Gloucestershire) were exempted from the restricts of the Act of 1557, denoting that Elizabeth gave favours to certain courtiers of those districts.
sometimes its official acquiescence. The Discoveries of the sixteenth century created vast opportunity for the peerage and the bourgeoisie, and the state appropriated its share of the booty. The commercial and financial expansion — companies, colonies, capitalism in textiles, capitalism in mining, capitalism in finance — was conducted by the commercial classes, but the conservative statesmen drew the leading strings. The State's interference, paternalistic mediation though it professed to be, was resisted in the form of the Puritan movement and the Puritan ethos. This found expression in the opposition to the traditional policy of stereotyping economic relations by checking enclosures, controlling food supplies and prices, interfering with the money market and regulating the condition of wage contract and apprenticeship. It also reacted vigorously to the State's allocation of power, especially in the newly established National Church.

(ii) Organisation of Power

If the Crown was to represent a public power that was seemingly above society, and to reinstitute the territorial organisation of society from the feudal particularisms, to
the functions of a national life, it had to enhance the
spectacularity of that office. The Tudor rulers, hardpressed
for finances though they were, spared no costs to maintain
the aura of gorgeous splendour. In order to impress its
alienation from civil society, it had to revise its former
role of feudal overlordship, as 'primus inter pares', that it
differed in kind and not merely in degree of the social order.
The outward forms of this awe of 'majesty' was therefore
maintained as Henry VII's treasure of precious jewels and gorgeous
banquets and Henry VIII's much publicised junketings in the
field of the Cloth of Gold are but examples. However the State
required to establish not only the notion of this public power
that stood above society, but it also necessitated the actual
marshalling of power, in the form of an army, bureaucracy,
(police forces), the judiciary, the priesthood and the material
adjuncts of these repressive institutions.

We therefore take a glance at the mobilisation of the
financial resources of the Tudor rulers, this being one of the
primary functions of the state. For the most part revenue was

funded by methods that were medieval. Henry VII's deliverance of land as statutory gifts to those nobles who fought for him at Bosworth was done with a stinting hand. Henry increased Crown lands by attainders and their revenues by ingenious devices. By a vigorous campaign of resumption he brought back much land that was passing into the hands of his subjects. Feudal incident (e.g. homage, wardship and marriage), selling of declining knighthoods, customs duty on trade (e.g. poundage, tunnage), mulcts, through the administration of justice and penalising organised rebellion were the resources that the Crown drew upon with determination. The bare figures speak of Henry VII's noteworthy success in financial amassment. He raised the income from Crown lands from £13,633 to £32,620, and the customs revenue from about £20,000/- to over £40,000/-. For the first five years of his reign his income averaged £142,000/-. He repaid all his loans and by 1492 could show a surplus in the royal accounts. At his death, his son inherited a patrimony estimated at about a million and a half pounds. 

---

48 See Bindoff, op.cit., p. 65. See also Myers, op.cit. p. 205.
49 Morris op.cit. p. 44.
Henry VII maintained lucrative peace but Henry VIII was to expend his treasury in the wars of his early years in office. The dissolution of monasteries and forcible possession of land was an inevitable outcome of the need for resources of the Crown. Since land had become a saleable commodity (we have already referred to the transactions of this land) it was deemed the most plausible source of income for the Crown. Elizabeth continued to finance her wars from sale of lands though the debasement of the coinage added to her revenues. It was her later involvement in privateering on the Northern waters as a party to joint stock venture, and the cargoes from the New World that substantially augmented the royal treasury.

List of Miscellaneous Financial Revenue Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customs Revenue</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimated Revenue</th>
<th>Estimated Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>£ 27,000</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>£ 83,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>£ 40,000</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>£ 100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue from Crown Lands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Income from wards lands under Crown Management (1485-1509)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td>£ 353</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>£ 5422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>£ 343</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>£ 5626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>£ 1588</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>£ 6163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>£ 3003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dietz, p. 31

The growing insoluble contradictions in society required the state's repressive intervention when necessary. Though it was called upon to project as the essential guardian of justice and peace, it was necessary to establish those institutions that would maintain its power. These institutions are the embodiment of state power which alienates itself from society. Tudor England did not have a servile bureaucracy, a standing army, or a regular police force. However, its central monarchy was constrained to maintain an officialdom, councillors, the innumerable government departments and those power wielders of the state machinery. How the state organises its power apparatus and how it coheres upon the State executive, are the questions that we dwell upon, thereby to gain insights into the complexity that was the Tudor State.

---

50 quoted from Powell and Cook, op.cit., p. 25-6.
To this end, Tudor rulers proceeded with meticulous zeal to undermine those administrative departments that had hitherto cramped the ruler from organising the State centrally. As a matter of fact English governmental administration had witnessed several attempts at circumventing baronial domination and centralising authority, and even personalising it in the medieval King. Edward I (1239-1307) had made a bid to override baronial interference in the Chancery (the great secretarial department) and expedite procedures by the introduction of the Wardrobe and the privy seal. However by the Ordinance of 1371, this was assimilated under baronial control. Edward II (1284-1327) contrived to assert royal control (especially in matters of military organisation) and to this end the Chamber and signet seal was installed. But again centrifugal baronial forces contrived to override the centralising process. Henry Tudor made the most effective contribution to Tudor administration by the introduction of the Chamber as the government repository of revenue in place of the stereotype Exchequer, and was to serve directly under the King. (Bacon claimed to have seen an account book of Empson's in which every page

51 Myers, op. cit., p. 38-40.
was initialled or annotated by the King's own hand. The Treasurer was appointed as a trusted servant. A proliferation of government departments in the Tudor reign introduced their own seals thus rendering obsolete the great seal and the privy seal. The hectic land transactions of Henry VIII necessitated the introduction of those revenue collecting departments, such as Court of General Surveyors, the Court of Wards and Liveries, the Court of Augmentation etc. A similar development is noticeable in the Council. From an unwieldy size of the medieval council the privy council formed the core group of councillors to the monarch, whose activity and duties were bound to the monarch and served as a link between king and country, king and court. Indeed it was to this band of councillors that Tudor governments turned for the maintenance of the newly developed nation state. Overriding magnate domination of the medieval council, even at the expense of criticism of deleting the King's 'natural counsellors', this council accommodated a smaller band of trusted servitors. Wolsey's suggestions in the Eltham Ordinances of 1526 were rendered into practice by Cromwell.

52 See Morris, op.cit., p. 35.
Though the Curia was turning increasingly into a lay body, it was the Privy Council, as an offshoot of the Council itself, that made the monarch's central governance more efficient. In fact it has earned the reputation of being an 'omnicompetent, omniscient Elizabethan privy council.... a vital link between Crown and Parliament, Crown and Country'. The diversity of its concerns can be estimated from a recorded agenda of the privy council's meetings: 'Meeting at Westminster in February 1566 it discussed the provisioning of its troops in Ireland, the release of certain prisoners in the Tower on bail, the licensing of the French Ambassador's butcher to sell meat in Lent, and a warrant to finance children's plays at Court'. 54 Again in August 1562 (at Greenwich) 'the Council discussed cases of fraud in Wiltshire, the problem of gypsies in Oxfordshire and military levies in Essex. 55 From the 'repair of a pier at Scarborough' to the 'arrest of an Oxford doctor for recusancy', the Privy Council deemed no matter as unimportant for its watchful eye. In the economic sphere its supervision and

54 Pawell & Cook op.cit. p. 16.
55 Pawell & Cook. op.cit., p. 16.
management penetrated the whole fabric of society. 'Wages, the movement of labour, the entry into a trade, dealings in grain and in wool, methods of cultivation, methods of manufacture, foreign exchange business, rates of interest -- all are controlled, partly by statute but still more by the administrative activity of the council. In theory, nothing is too small or too great to escape the eyes of an omniscient state'. Indeed the avowed purpose of the Privy Council was 'the preservation of ... good subjects in quyness among themselves'.

Subverting the self perpetuating oligarchy of the Council by the despotic assertion of prerogative practice. Tudor rulers were able to make their choice of the inner ring of councillors upon whom supreme power devolved. The Privy Council could issue proclamations having the force of law, it could make treatises and receive foreign ambassadors, dispose of the armed forces, appoint or dismiss official, superintend local authorities,

---

56 Tawney op.cit., p. 167. For an elaborate system of 'controls' applied by Tudor government through its council, see Tawney op.cit. p. 167-9.

What transpires is that the monarch's supreme power with the close supervision by this powerful body of officers, was the chief test of meaningful governance. It may be noted that with Henry VIII's death, the Crown put to commission to tide over the minority of Edward VI failed in its purpose and the choice of a Protector was the immediate outcome. However the lack of monarchical (and therefore supreme) authority brought faction and jealousy. Only the blood royal could presumably spearhead the powerful council, (who could even question Mary Tudor's right to the throne), and very soon Somerset and after him Warwick found their way to the Tower Green. 'Complete dependence upon the King an omnicompetence under him' was the mark of the Tudor Privy Council.

The versatility of this form of conciliarism urgently called for the service of a Secretary, which office became one of the novel additions to Tudor government. So far the Chancellor had served as the intermediary of Crown and Chancery. Wolsey had served as Chancellor and Papal Legate, rising with

---

58 Bindoff, op. cit. p. 60-1.
sudden acumen to heights of power and fortune. But a
receding Chancery (now mainly a Court of Law) and a more
personal form of royal rule, gave prominence to a Cecil
and Burghley with a legal stamp of the Privy Council in
their keeping. 59

The weakening of feudal ties and their forcible
reassertion on the one hand, and increasingly potential
social protest in the form of the rabble, whose future lay
in the new forms of contradiction, thereby called for the
vigorous deployment of State power. The Tudor State provided
this oppressive power in the form of its Conciliar Courts
and Regional Councils. While the judiciary worked at legali­
sing the acute forms of social oppressions, the councils
purported to bring 'Law and order' and regulate central
authority. In those regions of the North and Wales, where
feudal magnates continued to harbour notions of independent

59 Robert Cecil (son of Burghley, and Elizabeth's principal
secretary from 1596-1603) describes the intimate relations of the
secretary with his ruler: "A secretary must either conceive the
very thought of a king, which is only proper to God or a king must
 exercise the painful office of a secretary, which is contrary to
majesty and liberty; or else a prince must make choice of such a
servant of such a prince as the prince's assurance must be his
confidence in the secretary. And the secretary's life his trust
in the prince". - Robert Cecil, The State and Dignity of a
secretary of State's place, (P & C op. cit. p. 22).
power, and allied with bordering Scotland with its ally, France, the Tudor central authority clamped its despotism with ruthless vigour. During the reign of Elizabeth the Regional Councils were to become an even more important feature of English government. Under the directions of Parliamentary statutes but with independent powers of local government, the regional council brought the rebellious North to succumb to central direction. Represented by local gentry, lords, justices, and presided by the Queen's personal appointee, it was successful in directing trade, curbing rebellion, and bringing religious conformity.  

The Council of Wales, established under a similar procedure, served to exemplify Elizabethan (Tudor) success in the organisation of State power and monarchical supremacy. It came with a heavy hand upon the Marcher Lordships of Wales, with its inquisitorial procedures. The Act of Union of 1536 empowered the Council to try any criminal offence including treason. Entrusted with prerogative powers it was a prototype of the Privy Council and served as the agency of enforcement.

---

60 Lord Huntingdon, the Queen's cousin was the most notoriously successful of the Presidents of the North. The formal abolition of the Council in 1641, soon after the execution of its last President, the Earl of Stafford, was a concomitant to the destruction of the Stuart monarchy.
of an ever growing body of statutory laws. Its penal procedures including fine, execution and torture made this council a formidable weapon of state repression. Historians have therefore rightfully adjudged the Tudor State to have effected a decentralisation.  

The task of assimilating the various territorial parts of the nation under the aegis of a central monarchy, formidable as it was, was effectively conducted by Tudor supreme control with Parliamentary ratification. In the centre this organisation was enterprising and controlled, and its effectively in the regional councils speaks of efficiency in its functionaries. This was largely performed through the services of the squirearchal volunteers, known as the Justices of the Peace since the 14th century. In the absence of a professional civil service, the disuse of whatever individual government office that existed, (Sheriff, Coroner, etc.) the supervision of the realm fell upon the six or seven hundred J.P.'s covering the country in petty and quarter sessions. Since the 14th century the unpaid services of the country gentry was deployed in an increasing number of ways --- as jurors, as assistants to the itinerant justicers,  

61 Norris, op. cit. p. 29.
as commissioners of array, as tax collectors and as coroners.
As Keepers of the peace, and retitled as justices of the peace under Edward III, the J.P.s of the Tudor regime performed as administrative, police, and judicial functionaries. Centrally empanelled, they were also at the behest of the strong centre of the Tudors, which the feudal era had failed to provide. Hence the lack of performance of the J.P.s in that period.
Primarily deployed to maintain law and order, they proved to become censors of all other local officials, and the safeguard of Tudor policy in economics, morals and manners. Two particulars of the office of J.P.s characterise Tudor centralising policy and inventiveness; one was that they functioned by central appointment rather than election (as were the Sheriffs), and second, they rendered service on the expectation of status and political progress rather than concurrence of remuneration. 62

Land mobility, land speculations and appropriation, and new social relations caused widespread distress in society especially after the Henrician Revolution. Legalising of these new transaction in land, wrenching of privileges on the seas, new modes of production in manufactures, mining etc. as well

62Bindoff, op.cit. p. 56-7, See also Myers, op.cit. p.220-1.
stabilising the older modes in town and country, called for a large degree of litigation besides the political enforcement of law. The ancient law courts, once 'coram rege' were now independent institutions, proceeding upon the highly developed common law of England. While the nations of Europe, dictated by constitutional exigencies, adopted the Roman Law, England continued with an enlarged and modified common Law or Federal Law. Thus the Ancient Courts as the repository of the king's law continued to function, though not as 'coram rege', and in fact the king himself was understood to be subordinate to the law. The common law courts were eventually to posit as an opposition to the franchise of statutory and conciliar legal procedures in the time of James. For in the prerogative courts, the Tudors were empowered to centralise juridical procedures and carry out swift justice, unhampered by common law procedures, and allowing absolutist liberties to the central monarch. (Star Chamber, Court of Requests, Admiralty and High Commission). This procedural innovation lay in reinstitution not on actual foundation in this period. Star Chamber, the juridical constituent

---

of the Privy Council was quick to adjudicate in cases of 'Maintenances, oppressions and other outrages of any persons in the country'. Riots and unlawful assemblies', censorship of printing etc. kept star chamber's vigilance upon the community strict and penetrating. The state's coercive apparatus enhanced by the constitution of these prerogative courts, may be ascertained from the royal document for the 'Establishment of the Court of High Commission'. Here the ruler's powers in the choice of members, commissioning of powers for the maintenance of order, in short the establishment of a penal court, defines the central powers of Elizabethan (Henrician) government and its methods of rigorous persecution;

Establishment of the Court of High Commission
(1559, Prothero, 227-231)

Elizabeth by the grace of God (&c.). To the reverend father in God Mathew Parker, nominated bishop of Canterbury, and Edmund Grindall, nominated bishop of London, and to our right trusted and right well-beloved councillors Francis knowles our vice-chamberlain and Ambrose Cave, knights and to our

trusty and well-beloved Anthony Comke and Thomas Smyth, 
knights, William Bill our almoner, Walter Haddon and 
Thomas sackford, masters of our requests, Rowland Hill 
and William Chester, knights, Randoll Cholmely and John 
Southcots, serjeants at the law, William May, doctor of 
law, Francis Cave, Richard Gooderick and Gilbert Gerrard, 
esquires, Robert Weston and Thomas Huick, doctors of law, 
greeting.

(II) Where at our Parliament holden in Westminster the 25th 
day of January and there continued and kept until the eighth 
of May then next following, amongst other things, there was 
two Acts and Statutes made and established, the one entitled
'An Act for the uniformity of common prayer (&c)' and the 
other entitled 'An act restoring to the Crown the ancient 
jurisdiction (&c),' as by the same several Acts more at 
large doth appear; and where divers seditious and slanderous 
persons do not cease daily to invent and set forth false 
rumours tales, and seditious slanders, not only against us 
and the said good laws and statutes, but also have set forth 
divers seditious books within this our realm of England, 
meaning thereby to move and procure strife, division and 
dissension amongst our loving and obedient subjects, much 
to the disquieting of us and our people;

(III) Wherefore we, earnestly minding to have the same Acts 
before mentioned to be duly put in execution, and such
persons as shall hereafter offend in anything contrary to the tenor and effect of the said several statutes to be condignly punished, and having especial trust and confidence in your wisdoms and discretions, have authorised, assigned and appointed you to be our commissioners, and by these presents do give our full power and authority to you, or six of you, whereof you the said Mathew Parker, Edmond Grindall, Thomas Smyth Walter Haddon, Thomas Sackford Richard Gooderick and Gilbert Garrad to be one, from time to time hereafter, during our pleasure, to enquire as well by the oaths of twelve good and lawful men, and also by witnesses and all other ways and means ye can devise, for all offenses, misdoers and misdemeanours done and committed and hereafter to be committed or done contrary to tenor and effect of the said several acts and statutes and either of them, and also of all and singular heretical opinions, seditious books, contempts, conspiracies false rumours, tales, seditions, misbehavior, slanderous words or shewings, published, invented or set forth, or hereafter against us or contrary or against any laws or statutes of this our realm of England and all and every the coadjustors, counsellors procurers and abettors of every such offender.

(IV) And further, we do give power and authority to you or six of you (quorum as before), from time to time hereafter
during our pleasure, as well to hear and determine all
the premises, as also to enquire, hear and determine
all and singular enormities, disturbances and misbehaviors,
done and committed or hereafter to be done and committed
in any church or chapel, or against any divine service, or
the minister or ministers of the same, contrary to the
laws and statutes of this realm; and also to enquire of,
search out and to order, correct and reform all such persons
as hereafter shall or will obstinately absent themselves
from church and such divine service as by the laws and
statutes of this realm is appointed to be had or used....

Wrenching the deeply ingrained power from the Church,
being the most formidable of its tasks, the Tudor State
unleashed its powers of oppression with a vengeance. But
besides the forcible assimilation of land and treasure, it
had to enhance its civil and legal powers vis-à-vis the Church.
This had been a battle waged long enough as the praemunire Acts

\[65\] quoted from *Select Documents of English constitutional
History*, eds. George Adams and H.M. Stephens, Macmillan, 1901
tified. The series of statutes of provisors and praemunires, culminating in the great statute of Praemunire (1393), was originally enacted to meet specific grievances of the English king and his higher clergy at the hands of the contemporary pope. Under Henry VIII it went on to affirm superiority of lay courts over ecclesiastical courts and was one of the most potent weapons of the king in his breach with Rome. 'Benefit of clergy' was a grievance which was voiced often by the laity and it was mitigated to an extent by a general Act of 1512 (4 Hen. VIII Cap 2). The case of Richard Hunner and Doctor Horsey brought these protestations to a head. The right of temporal courts to trial of lower clergy was obtained permanently. However it was the praemunire that sealed the superiority of powers of jurisdiction of the temporal courts over canon law courts under the threat of life imprisonment and forfeiture of possessions. Protestations from the clergy ('The supplications against the ordinance' 1532) was ignored and the king was empowered to henceforth veto acts of convocation and revise the existing corpus of canon law if necessary. After the Act of Appeals of 1533, appeals in the last resort was made not to Rome but to Crown via Chancery. 66

The Tudors lacked the supreme apparatus of repression in the form of a standing army. Though some historians are of the opinion that feudal private retainers had been disbanded by Henry VII they in fact continued to serve their military function, though with some vital modifications. Rather than serve at the behest of their feudal overlords, these bands were now bound in allegiance to the King and summoned by conscription of the central authority. The Statute of 1558 reinstated the terms of the Assizes, (Assizes of Arms, Henry II) thereby rendering invalid the contract form of levying troops. The authority was commissioned to the Lord Lieutenant, which office significantly, was entrusted always to members of the nobility. The feudal system had recourse to two methods of raising troops: (i) the corvee method of land tenureship that also imposed the obligation of tenant to serve the lord for forty days. Difficult to assemble, incoherent in form, unwilling to fight abroad, this form of organisation lost its usefulness. It was summoned for the last time in 1385 (ii) the contract method by which troops were raised by the regional overlords only with the payment of money by the

---

67 ibid., p. 53.
68 Myers, op. cit., p. 41-2.
king, was ensured better organisation of the military force. However this was again a deterrent to the centralising power and authority, while the regional powers were in a position of bargain. The contract settled wages, obligations and rewards, for which the ruler was led to impose taxes and rely on parliamentary grants. This in turn arrogated parliamentary directives (as happened to Edward III (1312-77) and Richard II (1367-1400)\(^69\), thereby restricting the ruler's authority further.

The levy snire had existed as a less important source of military force beside the contract method. The compulsory investment of arms by the mail citizenry of the county and supervised by the sheriff, was not a new invention (ref: the statute of Winchester 1285). The heydey of feudalism had rendered the Crown's directives impotent. It was now the local magnates under direct orders of the Crown in the form of the commission of array, or the signet letter, who could raise the militia, the former for home defence and the latter as expeditionary forces.\(^70\) Anything akin to a permanent force was Henry VIII's 'Yeo men of the Guards' and the 'Gentlemen at Arms', little more than palace guards.\(^71\)

\(^{69}\) Myers op.cit., p. 42.  
\(^{70}\) See Sindoff, op.cit., p. 52-3.  
\(^{71}\) See Myers, op.cit., p. 218.
The Elizabethan age was to see the development of another form of military power, that is the marine forces. At a very nascent stage of institution it was to be the force of the future for the imperial British Crown. As early as Henry VII's rule this force was harnessed as a form of defence of the waters. Though only a miniature fleet it was to ward the real threat from the continent in the form of potential claimants and their allies. Maritime enterprise was to supply the resources for the English fleet at the time of its confrontation with Spain and in its colonial exploits. Elizabeth was to commission Hawkins for the building of a modernised fleet even in the face of conservative opposition, but this modernisation together with merchant support was to yield the victories of Armada and the colonial conquests of the later 16th century.72

If the central monarch could commission its power upon those whose services it enjoined, and was the repository of unbounded power, this power at the apex was also shared, though not equally. For in the English Parliament, the State's power

72See Bindoff, op. cit., p. 226.
found definition as the constitutional limiting body of monarchical autocracy. Parliament, at least nominally, was supreme. Therefore the relationship of this reciprocal power requires analysis.

The chief mark of Parliament's supreme power, in the Tudor age, was that it was the court of highest appeal and the supreme law making authority of the nation. The medieval Parliament had carried on much of the judicial activity of the king in this assembly. With acumen, Tudor rulers were to wrest authority from Parliament to embark upon their own independent missions. Henry VIII was to allow Parliament to assist and underpin his revolutionary measures, but the Tudors in general, from the beginning of their dynastic rule, were reticent about summoning Parliament. In fact the judicial and legislative function of Parliament was almost abandoned, the ruler preferring to confine this to the active Council and Chancery and ultimately to Star Chamber. Jurisdiction in error over common law courts was therefore restricted to the ruler and his trusted servants. Impeachment by Parliament became unknown. 73

73 Bindoff, op. cit., p. 215-16.
It was the revival of the ancient royal prerogative by the Tudors that strengthened their position vis-à-vis Parliament. The ruler could summon, prorogue or dismiss a Parliament at leisure. He could determine the agenda of Parliament and could veto or amend bills it produced. He could still exercise his discretion as to which lords he summoned to Parliament and could create new peers by letters patent. He could create county and borough seats by charter. In fact it was a matter of dispute whether Parliament could transact any business without the physical presence of the monarch. Whereas the Lancastrian rulers (especially Henry VI) had to acquiesce to clear violation of royal rights, the Tudors were alert to assert them. In fact during the later day strife between James I and the common law parliamentarians, it was upon this principle of prerogative that James looked for support, to countermand the heated controversy.74

Once having wrested supreme power, Tudor monarchs were loathe to part with them. Henry VIII adopted the illustrious title, 'Henry the Eighth by the grace of God King of England,

France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, and of the Church of England and of Ireland on earth the Supreme Head'. Elizabeth was to maintain with the assurance of majesty, that she would include the Thirty Nine Articles (the creed of the New Anglican Church) by virtue of her supremacy not by virtue of statute. However Elizabeth was well advised to acquiesce with commons when the need arose (as the Monopoly Act testifies), but James' court and his own feudal inclinations propelled him on to a confrontation that boded no well for the English monarchy in the future.

We have referred to the mediation that the State contrives to effect in the earlier section. This mediation finds representation in the constitution and development of parliament at this period. Two attributes of Parliament as a constitutional body of governance stand out as defining its character in the Tudor age: (i) the gradual but sure development of the commons (ii) its supremacy as a legislative body and its part in establishing the newly defined powers of the monarch.

We have already referred to the second point. We therefore make a brief assessment of the former, that is the development of the House of commons and the corresponding decline of noble
sovereignty. We may here mention that historians have rendered two modes of historiography as already overworked and outdated that is (i) the religio-constitutional mode of political narrative and (ii) what was presented as the Marxist contention of the rising bourgeoisie and decaying feudal classes. Here we do not purport to present the materials with a view to elaborating these methodological types. Oversimplifications such as 'rising bourgeoisie etc' do not explain the complexity of the situation. Interdisciplinary methods have of course greatly advanced insights. However, we affirm that theoretical foundations do not limit research. With standard historical material available, we have tried to make a summation of the State, its mediation between classes, and its organisation of power. Lastly whether the State, at this historical period, has acquired a degree of independence of classes.

First convened in England in 1265, Parliament (from the French word 'Parler' — to speak) brought together the feudal nobility, knights, and rich townspeople to deliberate upon matters of taxation. This had been the cause of hostilities

75 For an elaborate discussion of the development of methodology in the history of the aristocracy of this period, see L. Stone, *The Causes of the English Revolution*, Ch II, p. 20 passim.
between the King and his rich subjects and the peasantry had chosen this moment to express its animosities. Parliament was therefore convened. However this assembly continued to meet with representation from nobles and commons and became part of governmental procedure. Though the barons and lords were initially summoned at the king's behest, they took on the form of a hereditary oligarchy in Parliament. However the commons did not pay only silent attendance. As early as 1376, in what is known as 'Good Parliament', Sir Peter de la Mare (Steward of the Earl of March and was the first speaker of the commons,) had vigorously attacked the administration. Parliament came to take on the functions of a court of justice, and was an assembly for important policy resolutions. With the deposition of Richard II, Parliament's identity as the chief court of justice, (the king was after all the fount of justice), was sealed. Law was custom, however its ordinance had hitherto been the preserve of the council, together with the king's independent statutes. The Lancastrian rulers had failed to assert their prerogatives in the face of noble domination and

76 Ye Agibalova, G. Donskoy, History of the Middle Ages, Moscow. p. 215.
77 Myers op. cit., p. 47-50.
commons began to insist on accounting of the taxes collected. The commons disclaimed any rights to judicial and legislative functions, while asserting their rights to control over taxation.\textsuperscript{78} The corporate identity of the commons increased and their supplications became frequent. The commons became an indispensable part of legal procedures and one of the components for the assent of any statute. Non resident burgher representation, limitation of the parliamentary franchise, and the government's concern to find parliamentary seats for civil servants, are some of the developments indicating the growing importance of the House of Commons.\textsuperscript{79}

That brings us to the question of how the Tudor monarchy defined its authority and control in Parliament and maintained its unquestioned superiority over Parliament, even if Parliament was the ultimate institution for the allocation of monarchical power. The English Parliament, as we have noted, developed a

\textsuperscript{78}Myers, op. cit., p. 136.

\textsuperscript{79}By contrast the French Estates General, convened in 1302 by Philip IV, was a measure to secure support of the social estates against the Pope. This was an assembly of representatives of the clergy, the nobility, the rich townspeople all being included in one forum. This became a regular principle for the introduction of a new tax. But a discordant assembly due to partial imposition of taxes, that is upon the peasants and craftsmen only, ultimately weakened the influence of Estates General on state affairs. This accentuated the growth of the centralising feudal state of France to emerge as an absolute monarchy in the latter half of the 17th century especially under Louis XIV. (1642-1715).
tradition of dignity and influence and it was the Tudor despots who by sheer skill and astuteness managed to toe the line in Parliament.

Henry VII, soon after his ascension to the throne had his ascent to the throne and his marriage ratified in Parliament. This was the indication that Parliament could seal and make irretrievable its sanctions, but then Parliament could be summoned only by the king. Thus Henry VII began with a determination to assert his prerogatives, more precisely his sole right of summons of Parliament both in its frequency and in the choice of its members. The crown now through aggrandizement the legatee of those baronial houses that had comprised the refractory nobility in Parliament, purported to be preferential in its summons. Obnoxious and impoverished lords were not enlisted. The Upper House had become predominantly a lay assembly. It came to consist more and more of lay peers of recent creation and spiritual ones who were royal nominees. It shrank in independent importance.

However Parliament became the forum where questions of 'national' import were deliberated with vigour. Henry VIII's Reformation was carried through with parliamentary support,
just as the question of succession was thrashed out with meticulous determination. It has been pointed out that Parliament's role in Henry's Revolution was after all not seen to be as momentous by contemporaries as later day scholars would have us believe. It is maintained that the Parliamentary Acts had merely the force of declaration not legislation during the Reformation Parliament.  

But Parliament's preponderance as a legislative institution was definitely assertive. Though Elizabeth did not allow question of succession and her marriage to be debated, Parliament's muscles had developed considerably. On the other hand the prestige of commons was on the ascend. Qualification for county franchise was restricted to persons resident in the county having freehold to the minimum value of forty shillings per annum. Effectively, only persons with land of the annual value of £20 were eligible for election (according to the statute of 1445, 23. Hen VI c. 14). Borough franchise was vested in a very small body especially in boroughs that had been granted charters by the Tudors. Thus the House

80 see Woodward, op. cit., p. 62.
of Commons began to gain exclusivity. The creation of a further 62 peers by Elizabeth was indicative of the entry of an increased number of gentry into the House of Commons. 81

A list of important events describing the growth of privilege and procedure is furnished below:

1523 Speaker More's request for free speech. The first known request by a Speaker on this theme.

1543 Ferrers' Case. The Commons released one of its members, George Ferrers, a burgess of Plymouth, by despatching their own serjeant-at-law, claiming that his mace was sufficient authority to secure release.

1555 Discussion by Commons of a Bill prohibiting any paid servant or dependent of the Crown from sitting as a member. Nothing came of this discussion.

1571 (5 April) Case of Thomas Clark and Anthony Bull. Both men, non-members of the House, committed to the serjeant's ward for 'presuming' to enter the commons.

1576 Peter Wentworth's (burgess for Tragony) famous speech for liberty (8 February). Subsequent punishment and commitment to the Tower (9 February). Queen remits sentence (12 March)

81 Powell and Cook, op.cit., p. 38.
1581 Commons establishes its claim to judge the qualification of elected members. Arthur Hall's case occurred in the same year. Hall, attacking the Commons as 'a new person in Trinity' in two pamphlets published in 1579-80, was fined imprisoned expelled from the House (14 February).

1584 Parry's case. After speaking in very violent terms against the Bill against Jesuits, Parry was sequestered and forced to submit (17 December).

1587 Peter Wentworth's questions. Arrest of Wentworth and other members for their unconstitutional dealings before the opening of Parliament.

1604 Goodwin's Case. Commons had to assert its right to settle questions of disputed elections.\(^\text{82}\)

The cases show that the voice of Commons was gaining audibility. However Parliament would always be given direction by the Queen's trusted Councillors. It no way detered the Queen from obtaining absolute power (as the establishment of High Commission indicates). However one Monopolies Message (Quoted below) indicates the Queen's subdued tones as she relents to opposition against the monopolies.

\(^{82}\)Quoted from Powell & Cook, op.cit., p. 38-40.
It pleased her Majesty to command me to attend upon her yesterday in the afternoon, from whom I am to deliver unto you all her Majesty's most gracious message, sent by my unworthy self. It pleased her Majesty to say unto me, That if she had an hundred tongues she could not express our hearty good-wills. And further she said that as she had ever held our good most dear, so the last day of our or her life should witness it; and that if the least of her subjects were grieved and herself not touched, she appealed to the throne of Almighty God, how careful she hath been and will be, to defend her people from oppressions. She said, That partly by intimation of her council, and partly by divers petitions that have been delivered unto her going to chapel or walking abroad, she understood that divers patents, that she had granted, were grievous to her subjects; and that the substitute of the patentees had used great oppression. But, she said, she never assented to grant anything which was malum in se. And if in the abuse of her grant there be anything evil, which she took knowledge there was, she
herself would take present order of reformation thereof. I cannot express unto you the apparent indignation of her Majesty towards these abuses. She said her kingly prerogative was tender; and therefore desireth us not to speak or doubt of her careful reformation; for, she said, her commandment given a little before the late troubles (meaning the Earl of Essex's matters) by the unfortunate event of them was not so hindered, but that since that time even in the midst of her most great and weighty occasion she thought upon them, and that this should not suffice, but the further order should be taken presently, and not in future (for that also was another word which I take it her majesty used), and that some should be presently repealed, some suspended, and none put in execution but such as should first have a trial according to the law for the good of the people against the abuses her wrath was so incensed, that she said that she neither could nor would suffer such to escape impunity so to my unspeakable comfort she hath made me the messenger of this her gracious thankfulness and care. 83

What we wish to point out is that the monarchy becomes the hub upon which power wielders and favourites rise to fortune. To the bourgeoisie this was noted to be restrictive to enterprise. The acuteness of this conflict is sharpened with James' favouritism in selling (and reselling) titles and monopolies. The Imposition was an attempt at national taxation and was deeply resented for its arbitrariness. Collision between king and Parliament was inevitable.

The growth of Commons in Parliament is an indication that the state is constrained to mediate for all classes. The facts point that a balance between the feudal and bourgeois classes was intended and the state intervention in the economic sphere was getting more complex in this period. The state over-reaches itself to be independent of classes.

One other form of social organisation seems to have had a direct association with the establishment of the state, that is the family. In the territorial divisions of society that the feudal system had organised, love and marriage had already developed from the preponderance of sexual ties to that of the family in the lower units of society. As bourgeois conditions develop, the family system begins to be redefined, gets more
complex, and relations of love get more subtle. In fact the family contains one of the most solid of social forms for not only the perpetuation of the human race but the prop of property and the State. Concomitant upon the new forms of intensified production and acquisition of property, the identity of interests of the middle classes articulates itself distinctly in the family system. The patriarchal form consolidates not only the family system, it expresses harmony with the centralised State, and the newly developing freedom of the individual. This has its counterpart in the domestic system in industry and agriculture at this transitional stage.

The most compelling feature of the family was its part as the determinant of blood-lineage and succession. Its intimate relations with property is historically proven. Property, both in terms of landed wealth and money, had been 'naturally' bestowed upon incumbents of blood descent, although the system confirmed primogeniture as the obvious choice. This was in practice not only with the nobility. Acquisition of bourgeois property, both in terms of land and money, conferred upon inheritance a legal identity, besides the already acclaimed blood identity. This also involved an ever expanding body of legal transactions and
professionalism. In the sphere of the State, the essential manifestation of the family system was the patriarchal form of government, namely monarchy. Its determinant was 'natural' succession or genealogy and its confirmation was parliamentary ratification and pre-enactment of the provisions of succession.

The family served as the most effective vehicle for the transmission of ideology and begins to express the community of interests especially in its participation in the religious movements of the age, whether through the religious revolutions of the Reformation and Puritanism, or the Protestant programme of the Tudor government, the family provided an organized unit for the indoctrination of its creeds. The reduced authority of the priest elevated the position of lay heads of households as mediator between both prince and householders and lord and family. Henry VIII's letter of 25th June 1535, urged the judges to influence "parents and rulers of families" to "declare, teach and inform their children and servants in the spiritualities" of the royal supreme headship of the church to the utter extirpation of the Bishop of Rome's usurped authority. 85

84 Bacon's *New Atlantis* is the most succinct illustration of this equation of the household and the State.

85 See C. Hill, op.cit., p. 432.
Elizabeth herself was to lay upon the heads of households the onus of sending their children and apprentices to church under penalty of a fine of £10 a month, claiming that, "For that every person having house and family is in duty bound to have especial regard to the good government and the ordering of the same." Besides the Church, the theatre, and the educational institutions, the State sought out the family as one of the most effective domain for the proliferation and control of ideology. What could not be achieved through the impersonal and hierarchical form of the noble households or the monastic units of feudal society, the household system of this age provided in its close-knit patriarchal modal. The spiritualisation of the household was to continue as the Puritan movement grew apace. Even before congregationalism became the rostrum for Puritan religious and political propaganda, the household had proven to be the most effective apparatus of bourgeois ideology and of social cohesion.

---

86 Ibid. The instrumentation of the State with regard to the family can be perceived as in Thomas Cromwell's Injunctions to the clergy in 1536: 'If they parents had been well educated and brought up in some good literature, occupation or mystery, they should, being rulers of their own family, have profited as well themselves as divers other persons, to the great commodity and ornament of the commonweal'. (C.Hill ibid p. 432). In a different context Dodin had claimed that the family was not only the true source and origin of the commonwealth, and also its principal constituent. 'The well ordered family in the true image of the commonwealth, and domestic comparable with sovereign authority... All will be well with the commonwealth where families are properly regulated'. Ibid. p. 444.

87 A very small percentage of people in society were householders. These householders mainly consisted of apprentices, sometimes journeymen, dependents and poor. To the master (or 'paterfamilias') of such households the preachers addressed themselves.
II

The proposed establishment of a 'sovereign' nation state, under one government, one code of laws, one customs tariff, even one religion and one language, was a new drive for statehood. We have seen that the path of its establishment was strewn with violence and protest and required the organisation and coercion of unlimited power. But this state also required to establish its nationhood in relation to other nations that were cropping up from the feudal fragmented territories. In order to establish its 'independence' and 'sovereignty' the state had both the national and the international function to perform. If the 'nation' was to serve the interest of the newly developing propertyed classes, the means whereby the material wealth of the nation may be embraced by the monied classes, its interdependence with other states becomes an appendage to its territorial development.

Perry Anderson has highlighted that in the emerging international State system in Europe, diplomacy had become a vital part of politics. As an institutional invention it took roots in Italy in the 15th century and was to spread to western Europe in the 16th century, Referring to Garrett Mattingly,
Anderson notes that Renaissance Europe produced "a formalised system of inter-State pressure and exchange, with the establishment of the novel institutions of reciprocal fixed embassies abroad, permanent chancelleries for foreign relations, secret diplomatic communications, and reports, shielded by the new concept of 'extra-territoriality' " 88

However it must be noted that within the dynastic preponderance, the concept of the 'nation', promoted in sentiments of patriotism, was present only in the bourgeois literate milieu. Within the matrix of dynastic patrimony, the state conducted its diplomatic function largely through marriages and family alliances. Thus Henry VII had taken steps to protect himself through a ring of foreign alliances. By the treaty of Medina de Campo in 1489 his two year old son Arthur was contracted to marry Ferdinand's daughter Catherine of Spain. The treaty of Etaples with France in 1492 put an end to the support he had been giving Brittany's struggle for independence. In spite of continuing economic rivalry a peace settlement was made with Netherlands in 1496 (a claimant to his throne from

88 Perry Anderson, op.cit. p. 38.
these quarters was a possibility); the Poynings laws passed at Drogheda in 1494, theoretically made Ireland subservient to the English Crown; and in 1502 a marriage was arranged between Princess Margaret and James IV of Scotland. 89

By the logic of this archaic rationality, war was the outcome of inter-feudal rivalry, and the posited goal was the possible extension of land possessed. In this welter of territorial possession, national sentiments could scarce by applied. Even when warfare was conducted for possession of economic goods, as for instance piracy in the trade routes of the Baltic, English Channel, and the Mediterranean, it took the form of reprisal, licensed counter-piracy, and confiscations by individuals. 90 This was no less true of Elizabeth's complicity to the piracies of Drake and Hawkins and the colonial enterprise of the 16th and early 17th centuries. It was personal assent, rather than national ratification.

However, we note that the formal recognition of 'sovereign' territory was attempted with the Peace of Cateau-Cambresis of 1559.

89 J.R. Hale, Renaissance Europe, 1480-1520 1971, p.75.
90 ibid., p. 95.
Historians have pointed out that this was the formal ratification for the end of dynastic strife and forthcoming expected peace. To other historians, the Treaty was made in order to seal the unity of the two Catholic powers, France and Spain, and for this unified power to spearhead the counter-Reformation; in other words, the ecclesiastical zeal of the Roman Church against the Protestant powers. This alliance was to be cemented by the marriage of the daughter of King of France with Philip of Spain.\footnote{See, Cambridge Modern History, Vol. III, Ch. 8, C.U.P. 1934, p. 260 passim.} Quite accurately, it has been indicated that bankruptcy and heresy attended upon this peace treaty. However in the development of the Absolute State in Europe, with the recognition of national 'sovereignty' being incident upon this development, the peace treaty became inevitable. By the terms of this treaty, Italy was no longer to serve as territory for battle between French and Spanish interests, the Duchies of Piedmont and Savoy relieved of Imperial occupation, Calais was to be restored to France by Elizabeth I, the Alpine State restored, and Corsica transferred from French occupation to Genoa.\footnote{See J.H. Elliott, Europe Divided 1559-1598, 1968, p. 15-7.}
The Europe of Cateau-Cambresis also witnessed the crash of the banking houses, which were the repository of the commercial capital of the age. The financial capital of medieval Europe had been Italy, Flanders, and the Low Country, and of the 16th century it was Antwerp. These great centres of medieval finance and trade had collapsed in a succession, overturned by the political art of war. The banking houses Bardi and Peruzzi and later of the Fuggers had been the storehouses of stupendous wealth, of the material wealth brought into the mainland by the nations of Europe. It was to their lead-strings that the Princes of Europe had to swing, but which was to eventually run them dry. Thus the effect of the Hundred Years' War described by the Florentine chronicler Giovanni Villani:

During this war between the kings of France and England the merchants of the King of England were those of the Bardi and Peruzzi companies of Florence. Through their hands went all his revenues and wools and other things and supplied from them

---

93 See Tawney, op. cit., p. 76-7; also Elliott, op. cit., p. 11.
all his expenses, wages, and other needs. The expenses and other needs of the king so exceeded the rents and receipts that when he returned from this campaign, taking into account loans, purveyances and repayments made to them by the king, the Bardi found themselves to be his creditors in more than 180,000 marks sterling. And the Peruzzi more than 135,000 marks sterling which, since a mark was worth more than 4½ gold florins --- as much as kingdom is worth. This sum included many purveyances made to them by the king in the past but, however that may be, their great folly was that through greed for profit, or to recover what they had foolishly lent, they put all their wealth and that of others in the hands of one lord. And note that the greater part of this money came from investment or deposit from many citizens and foreigners. So that there was a great danger to them and to our city as you may see. Being unable to repay to their creditors in England, in Florence and elsewhere, they lost their credit and failed to pay and especially the Peruzzi, though they did not come to an end because of their great power and possessions in Florence and in the contado and their influence in the commune. But because of the defalcation and because of the expenses of the commune in Lombardy, the power and state of the merchants of Florence was reduced, and that of the whole common and merchant community. Every trade suffered from it, because with the
failure of these two pillars, which by their former power had divided with their great enterprises a great part of the commerce of all Christians and almost nourished the whole world, every other merchant was suspected and lost credit..... And to add to the bad state of these companies the King of France seized their partners and goods in Paris and throughout his realm and those of other Florentines; and because of the great sum of money which the commune had taken by forced loans from its citizens and spent in the campaigns of Lombardy and Lucca, because then of the repercussions of the loss of credit, other lesser companies of Florence soon afterwards failed. 94

War was the immediate cause of bankruptcy of the Antwerp financers as well. Henry VIII's futile wars in France was partly responsible for this collapse. However a network of financial and trading enterprise had been elaborated and their international ramifications had established the fierce nationalism of the age. 95 Thus the money expended on war had found their way to capitalistic


95 See Tawney, op.cit., p. 76-7. See also The Cambridge Modern History, Vol. I, Ch. 15, p. 493 passim.
enterprise, which in turn was to act as leverage to the establishment of nation states. England at the backwater of finance and trade in the middle ages was to find its economic salvation only with the Discoveries of the 16th century. These years of the latter half of the 16th century was marked by civil strife throughout Europe, with society divided upon religious issues. Roman Catholicism outtressed by Spanish Imperialism made its forages into the developing nations of the European mainland, to be counteracted by Protestant governments and Calvinist militancy.

The question of imperialism deserves a fuller treatment. Henry VIII's celebrated quarrel with the Pope (over the marriage of Anne Boleyn) Circumstanced the English nation to officially declare its claim to 'imperium'. Henry VIII their 'imperator' clearly affirmed that "this realm of England is an empire". Henry was dutifully backed by Parliament and his claims were affirmed by his lawyers, enlisting the authority of the noted historian Polycore Vergil. When the Protestant Queen Elizabeth inherited her father's dominions and his titles, English patriotism rallied behind the queen.

Ireland was colonised and subjugated by force. In daccon's phrase, "the last of the children of Europe", because of its
extended kin relationship and clan dynasties, Ireland was untouched even by the Church. Originally under the Lordship of England as a fief of Rome, subject to repeated batterings by the Tudor dynasty, which was finally resisted by the clan dynasties of Ireland, it was finally pulverised by the English commander Mountjoy and was militarily annexed. In the case of Scotland, formal annexation was to be proclaimed only with Cromwell, who declared the 'commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging' in 1664, fusing the imperial sentiment with the republican principles of the victorious Puritan party. Scotland, like Ireland had been under Celtic chieftainries and historically removed from the social structure of the Tudors. Though its dynastic rulers had made early attempts at Anglicization in its administrative and defence structures, feudalisation had occurred only in the low levels. Whereas, compelling internal warfare together with border hostilities with England had battered the State. Infiltration of English Protestantism marked the chaotic Scottish State, in a period when it was also subject to the preponderance of their erstwhile ally, France. When the Stuart King James VI of
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96 For Irish social history of this period see Anderson's comprehensive summary in 'Lineages' op.cit. p. 130-3.
Scotland unified the two nations in the person of James I of England, English imperial claims were fortified, while the Jacobean regime flaunted absolutism in Scotland, in Tudor fashion.97

The dichotomy of two conflicting views, that is nationalism at home and imperialism abroad, could be resolved in the practical field only by an attendant despotic state. Such were the absolute States (France, Spain mainly) that were ushering in the modern era and were officially claiming to be 'empires' and were indeed the principle vehicle of 'imperial conquest'. As Henry VIII was to dramatically prove, the 'sacrum imperium' as a formal constitution of the hegemony of the Christian Church with its papal monarchy in Rome, was the formost citadel of

97 For the social history of Scotland see Anderson op.cit., p. 135-7.
resistance to secular expansionism and independent authority.\textsuperscript{98} Therefore as a counter to this formulation Henry VIII styles himself an 'imperator' territorially exclusive of the Roman 'sacrum imperium', and thereby also the head of a national church. (Henry's was not an empty claim for Ireland was the prime evidence of ruthless territorial extension at this point).

To this end, the principles of secular imperialism had already been disseminated through cultural movements like the Italian Humanism and the Renaissance, and the more popular movement of the Reformation.

\textsuperscript{93}The Holy Alliance spreading its tentacles with the avowed mission of converting heretics to the Christian faith, lent its support and bestowed its sanctification upon a variety of empires, shifting from the Carolingian empire pitted against the Byzantine, to the German empires shifting around the European mainland, deploying in turn the Franks against the Scandinavians, and the Normans against Cecilians, subjugating the Moslems and Germanizing the Slavs. This Christianizing imperialism, was a prolonged and insidious process, stretching from the early middle ages and in fact supporting the 16th century Spanish imperialism, that besides mainland recoveries was shifting its battle front to the Atlantic, with Britain its chief contender for imperial/colonial spoils. (G. Lichtheim \textit{Imperialism}; Penguin p. 32-5).

Though the empires of the Hapsburgs and Romanovs continued with the concept of Christendom, imperialism came to denote "Empire of the Seas", pioneered by the Dutch, adapted by the British, ultimately inherited by their American colonies. Maritime predominance giving rise to mercantilism and colonialism were the chief socio-economic features of the post Cromwellian-commonwealth period. Not religion, but "patriotism" was to be the ideology fostered by the Whig aristocracy. "Free-trade", mercantilist expansion, "spheres of influence" of greater powers continued to be the jingo of imperialist practice and analysis. As Lichtheim remarks, imperialism was a "chameleon", "the term changed its meaning with the passage from the age of the old absolute monarchies (all officially styled 'empire') to the new world of the nation-state and then to the specifically modern era in which nationalism was sacrificed to the real or fancied needs of supranational entities adapted to global changes in the technological sphere". Lenin's use of the term in the 20th century as the highest form of monopoly capitalism has provoked a prolonged debate on the question of the hegemony of monopoly capital, though the former use of the term to mean primarily military force is not lost. (Lichtheim, ibid. p. 32-5 ff.)
The 'Holy Alliance' of Rome served the primary requisite of 'imperium' in the classical Roman sense. To the prescriptions of this concept Cicero had elaborated, by commenting that the "imperium populi Romani" was chiefly characterised by its legal power that is to enforce the law. It was a common place of idea for the governing class, and perhaps in popular parlance too, that a subject people once free, were now in submission to the political domination of the Roman Senate. The 'respublica' having been converted to an 'imperium' also required to change its form of government from the republican to the 'imperium Romanum' governed by the 'Princeps' and its officials. Imperium hegemony and the forms which it acquired in actual governance of Rome was a creation of a self-perpetuating oligarchy. The Roman commander or 'cum imperio', originally meant that he was entrusted with supreme military responsibility by the Roman Senate. With the acquisition of an empire, the term signified that the Roman people as a whole, had the dominion of the subject people. The 15th century states attempted to restore this notion of the imperium rather than the Papal one, and although hampered by its feudal origins it evolved the modern consciousness through

---

the centralised states, with their unsought benefits of taxation and conscription and a more fervent awareness of nationhood.

What we note is that, in the dynastic/imperial/confessional strife of Europe, Elizabeth's assistance and assurance had been towards the bourgeois/Protestant faction, even at the cost of sacrificing the blood royal. This was a destiny that the 'sovereign' state could not avoid. It implicated itself in the trade, war, and diplomacy of the European mainland, while it internationalised its colonial territories (Ireland, Wales and to an extent Scotland). Struggling for over thirty years these class contentions had now gone into sharp collision and Elizabeth had made her various agreement to help the cause of the bourgeoisie in the Netherlands (the Sea Beggars), France (Calvinist Huguenots; the treaty of Hampton Court - 1562) and gave support, not aid, to French government against Spanish infiltration (Treaty of Blois - 1572). These years also saw the Massacre of St Bartholomew (1572) and Netherlands insurgency (1572). The fall of Antwerp (1576) came as a calamitous consequence. Ireland, at Roman Catholic instigation, rebelled against English dominion but was crushed in 1580. Finally the defeat of the Armada in 1558 spelled doom for Spanish preeminence. Here the London bourgeoisie had
assisted Elizabeth by supplying money, men, and ships. We maintain that this victory tempered the English bourgeois consciousness as no other single event. From henceforth England flourished her imperial designs as a counter to Spanish power. The sending of Leicester's troops to the Netherlands in December 1585, the expeditionary force under Norris to Brittany in 1590, and under Essex to Normandy in 1591, are the retaliatory struggles of England against Hapsburg preponderance, while it foraged into Spanish colonial territory across the Atlantic, in the Iberian coasts, and pirated upon Spanish goods in the high seas.

That brings us again to the question of the nature of the State. Historians are agreed that this was a feudal state. We have traversed a wide spectrum of historical evidence in order to evaluate the state as it developed in the Tudor and early Stuart period. It was a fact that society was still largely feudal. The nobility continued with this form of production and obtained the favours and influence of patronage. The fraternity of guilds still existed where the small craftsman was also

---

100 In 1588, when the City was asked to provide 15 ships and 5,000 men for defence against the Spanish Armada, the City fathers pleaded for two days to think it over; they returned with an offer of 30 ships and 10,000 men. It was private enterprise that defeated the Spanish Armada and fought for the colonies inspite of government disapproval (See C. Hill, Puritanism and Revolution, 1958 p. 130)
the master. However as the legislations show there was a marked shift in social formations in the country, both in tenancy and in industry. At the same time in towns the rich bourgeois component formed a strong oligarchy, although submitting to royal charter. As for the gentry, usually originating in bourgeois circumstances and engaged in a changing and increasingly capitalistic forms of production, finds access to the ranks of the peerage, through the purchase of titles. To this articulate milieu the State took on a greater meaningfulness. We have tried to evaluate how the balancing of the classes of society was effected by the mediation of the State.

In the face of religious militancy, potential peasant insurgency, and diversity of economic interest in society, the State's powers of intervention was enhanced. However it lacked the supreme forces of coercion for dealing with both internal and external disorder. In the circumstances, the power apparatus, contingent upon a people armed (mainly peasantry), in other words, the forces of repression not sufficiently alienated, the possibility of anarchy always loomed large.

In this charged situation, the State power was constrained to rely upon informers and spies and Walsingham's secret service did creditable service to the Crown. The letter from Burghley to Walsingham in 1586 when the hunt was up for the conspirators of the Babington plot speaks volumes for the government's concern and the inadequacy of the power apparatus, its ruthlessness notwithstanding;

As I came from London homeward in my coach I saw at every town's end the number of ten or twelve standing with long staves, and until I came to Enfield, I thought no other of them but that they had stayed for avoiding of the rain, or to drink at some alehouse, for so they did stand under pentices (penthouses) at alehouses. But in Enfield finding a dozen in the plump, when there was no rain, I bethought myself that they were appointed as watchmen, for the apprehending of such as are missing. And thereupon I called some of them to me apart and asked them wherefore they stood there. And one of them answered 'To take three young men'. And demanding how they should know the persons, one answered with these words, 'Marry, my lord, by intelligence of their favour'. 'What mean you by that?' quoth I 'Marry' said they, 'one of the parties hath a hooked nose'. 'And have you' quoth I, 'no other mark?' 'No' saith they. And then I asked who appointed them. And they
answered one Banke, a head constable, whom I willed to be sent to me. Surely, sir, whoever had the charge from you hath used the matter negligently. For these watchmen stand so openly in plumps as no suspected persons will come near them; and if they be no better instructed but to find three persons by one of them having a hooked nose, they may miss thereof. And thus I think good to advertise you, that the justices that had the charge, as I think, may use the matter more circumspectly.

Therefore the autocratic power of the monarch became a necessity. In the absence of the apparatus for such absolutism, financial and implemental, the State's power converged notably on the ruler's performance. As the apotheosis of power, the Crown acquires a degree of independence of classes, hence its 'paternalism'. Therefore the concerns of the articulate milieu, both in literary and political circles, engaged upon the ruler's personal acumen to direct and survive in the warfare of sixteenth century politics.