

Oliver Cromwell: A Historiography

Nathan B. Gilson

HIST 602

Oliver Cromwell presents a unique historiographical challenge due to the difficulty in discerning the interpretive framework for understanding the period of history in which he lived. Oliver Cromwell was the successful military leader of the New Model Army which fought to preserve and even expand the power of Parliament, serving as a champion of the English tradition of the limitations placed on the monarchy. Yet, Cromwell also became a dictator who ruled more through military oppression and administration rather than by the rule of law, arguably becoming just as much of a tyrant as the King he replaced, albeit a dictator of a different political flavor. The beheading of Charles I and subsequent military dictatorship led by Oliver Cromwell positions him uniquely and squarely in the center of the crossroads of British history, at a time during which the political principles which would later be labeled as the “Enlightenment” were beginning to take shape in theory and in practice. For this reason, in the works of many different historians, Cromwell has become an empty vessel who can be portrayed as a savior or villain of history, as a brilliant military strategist or a fumbling politician, depending on the particular goals of the historian doing the remembering.

Not surprisingly, Cromwell was not well or positively remembered within English and British histories in the century after the Interregnum. Although taking a circular route to get there, the Royalists, Independents, and Presbyterians arrived at a compromised position of a limited monarchy by the close of the 17th century, and for that reason, the man who had led the forces that executed England’s King in 1649 became the historical scapegoat, as all sides for various reasons invested their hope and political capital back into the constitutional monarchy. The historical fact that Cromwell had no direct ties to the execution of Charles I had little bearing on the most popular claim that he was a “usurper” to the throne. One example of such an interpretation appeared in a 1721 pamphlet written by Thomas Gordon in which Gordon accused

Cromwell of being a tyrant who had used his position of power for “personal advantage.”¹ He also argued that Cromwell was successful because the people put too much faith in “one man” and became slaves themselves.² By Gordon’s time, Parliament and the King had reached a point of stability and constitutional compromise, and the English people were enjoying relative prosperity and international success. At that point, it was not *en vogue* to challenge the status quo, leading Gordon to label the entire Interregnum process “preposterous.”³

By the mid-century, a more balanced perspective of Cromwell emerged within British historiography. John Trenchard blamed Cromwell for the standing armies which had not been maintained in England except during the Interregnum.⁴ During the Glorious Revolution, the role of the English army, particularly in relation to civilian affairs and during peace time had been clarified in a way that would have strongly influenced Trenchard’s perception of the keeping of a standing army within England. Ironically, having been the beneficiary of the legacy of religious toleration that Cromwell had set into motion in England, Trenchard observed that

*A Protestant Musket kills as sure as a Popish one, and an Oppressor is an Oppressor, to whatever Church he belongs: The Sword and the Gun are of every Church, and so are the Instruments of Oppression.*⁵

Trenchard’s observations that religious affiliation did not insulate one from being remembered as a tyrant showed how far English society had advanced in a century since the Civil War.

More moderate contemporary views of Cromwell were also emerging within British society. In a 1763 lecture, Adam Smith kept the popular label for Cromwell as a “usurper” but also gave him a tremendous amount of credit for having created laws that were just and upheld

¹ Gordon, Thomas. “Of the Passions; that they are all alike good or all alike evil, according as they are applied” in *Cato’s Letters*, vol. 2, 1721.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Trenchard, John. *A Collection of Tracts Volume I*. London, 1751.

⁵ *Ibid.*

the balance of power by allowing the judiciary to execute justice rather than attempting to do so himself.⁶ Smith attempted to support the monarchy as an institution, but Cromwell's reformation of the legal system at large simultaneously. Adam Smith was also realistic in his interpretation of Cromwell, criticizing him for his hypocritical leadership when it came to the actual type of government that would be employed during the Interregnum. He accused Cromwell of putting an end to the republic by fancifully dissolving and appointing Parliaments as suited his particular political aims.⁷ The focus on Cromwell as a pragmatic dictator who was primarily committed to the maintenance of his own power would be a common refrain throughout centuries. Aside from his more moderate approach to Cromwell in general, it is also of particular note that Smith gave more credit to Cromwell as a politician than had been afforded in the works of Trenchard and Gordon.

It was also during the mid-18th century that positive interpretations of Cromwell's reign were proposed by political philosophers like William Blackstone. Blackstone, who became one of the most quoted legal commentators by the American rebels, spoke of Cromwell with terms that neared adulation, saying in his *Commentaries on the Laws of England* (1753) that "An Englishman may look back to the legal institutions and to the foreign policy of Cromwell with respect, with pride, nay, with exultation."⁸ That Blackstone would interpret Cromwell in this light is not surprising, given his generally more negative approach to the monarchy as an institution. It's also not surprising that Blackstone would compare Cromwell's policies to those of his successor, Charles II, and find the laws of the latter to be lacking in comparison.⁹

⁶ Smith, Adam. "Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms." University of Glasgow, 1763.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Blackstone, William. *Commentaries on the Laws of England: In Four Books Vol. I.* London, 1753.

⁹ Ibid.

The perspectives of various figures within the emerging American Republic were as varied as they were among their British cousins. John Witherspoon referred to Cromwell as a “remarkable person” who had honestly wanted to step down from power but has been unable to do so.¹⁰ With the context of the American War for Independence, Witherspoon’s defense of Cromwell is not surprising, since Cromwell had led the English movement which had essentially done what the colonists were proposing to do: renegotiate the social contract with a tyrannical king. To many ministers like Witherspoon, Cromwell was also a Puritanical hero who was used as the instrument of God to judge a tyrant.¹¹ Jonathan Mayhew, in a 1750 sermon justifying civil disobedience and rebellion against a king, saw the Cromwell-led Independents as those who had “preserve[d] the nation from slavery, misery and ruin.”¹² Mayhew never specifically mentioned Cromwell or Charles I in the sermon, but given the fact that the sermon was given on the centennial of the beheading of Charles I, and the fact that there seems to be only positive references to the actions of Cromwell during the time period, a generally positive disposition toward Cromwell can be inferred. Given the general dispositions of many Puritan ministers toward the King of England, the obvious parallels between the English Civil War period and the American Revolution, as well as Cromwell’s own faith, the interpretations expressed by Mayhew and Witherspoon are not at all surprising or in isolation.

Some Americans, like John Adams, were less enthusiastic in their interpretation of Cromwell, while still essentially positive. In a 1785 letter to John Jebb, Adams argued that the American situation was exceptional and could not have been repeated anywhere or under any

¹⁰ Witherspoon, John. “Dominion of Providence over the Passions of Men.” Princeton, 1776.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Mayhew, Jonathan. “A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers.” Boston, 1750.

other conditions than what had occurred during the War for Independence.¹³ Therefore, Adams argued, the failure of Cromwell's revolution was due to no fault of Cromwell's, but rather his attempt to establish republicanism was ill-fated from the beginning because it was not at the right time or the right place.¹⁴ Adams can certainly be found guilty of anachronism in his comparison of Cromwell to George Washington; Adams claimed that Washington probably would have taken the same actions during the Interregnum as Cromwell had done.¹⁵ Adams' letter was written before Washington had assumed the role as President of the United States, and was therefore in reference to the fact that Washington had resigned his commission and left the nation which had been won at the expense of his army in the hands of the politicians, however his willingness to make the comparison at all demonstrates Adams' high view of Cromwell. Adams' view of Cromwell seems to have been similar to Witherspoon's, in that much of it was in reference to Cromwell's standing in reference to the monarchy more than the specific actions of Cromwell himself. In an 1818 letter, Adams juxtaposed the "tranquility" that he attributed to Cromwell and the Parliament with the chaos of the Navigation Acts of 1660 instituted by Charles II.¹⁶

Not all Americans viewed Cromwell with even a measure of respect or grace. In a 1794 speech about the French Revolution, Noah Webster equated Cromwell to Robespierre in unflattering terms.¹⁷ To men like Webster, Cromwell represented a historical siren whose cries of liberty were treacherous and ultimately destructive to the freedom of the citizens who were foolish enough to follow.¹⁸ These American historians were not willing to offer a grudging

¹³ Adams, John. *A Letter to John Jeb*. London, 1785.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Adams, John. *A Letter to William Tudor*, Quincy, 1818.

¹⁷ Webster, Noah. "The Revolution in France." 1794.

¹⁸ Ibid.

respect to Cromwell as a political genius for being able to skillfully maneuver himself in such a way as to successfully supplant a king; their condemnation was mainly for those who didn't know better and allowed the wolf to watch the sheep. As Trenchard wrote:

Oliver Cromwell headed an Army which pretended to fight for Liberty, and by that Army became a Bloody Tyrant; as I once saw a Hawk very generously rescue a Turtle Dove from the Persecutions of two Crows, and then eat him up himself.¹⁹

It is fair to conclude that until the 19th century, historiographical interpretations of Oliver Cromwell within the British world were inextricable from the writer's view of monarchy in general. The specific actions of Oliver Cromwell were seldom evaluated with a lot of careful detail, and aside from a few outliers like Adam Smith, historians and politicians were not interested in presenting more than a view of Oliver Cromwell with a few caveats.

The magnitude of Cromwell's actions and his participation in the primary case study of the Enlightenment ensured that historians outside of England and its empire would also take note of the actions of Oliver Cromwell. Probably the most notable from this time period was Voltaire's *Short Studies in English and American Subjects* (1733) in which Voltaire endeavored to present a historical survey of the reigns of the English monarchs, necessarily to also include the Interregnum. Unlike his British and American contemporaries, Voltaire did present a nuanced view of the Lord Protector that was simultaneously appreciative of Cromwell's political skill and critical of his political philosophy. Voltaire interpreted Cromwell as a Puritanical religious fanatic who was able to eventually to overcome his fanaticism to become a great leader.²⁰ Voltaire credited Cromwell's Puritanism and circumstantial luck more than political aptitude as the reason for his ascent to his status as "Lord Protector." According to Voltaire,

¹⁹ Trenchard, *A Collection of Tracts Vol. 1*

²⁰ Voltaire, *Short Studies in English and American Subjects* from *The Works of Voltaire, Vol. XIX*, 1733.

since Cromwell was a Puritan, he fell out of favor with the Church and the State, and these circumstances eventually positioned him to have greatness thrust upon him.²¹

Although he was not born as a skilled political leader, according to Voltaire, Cromwell rose to the task and “became fully as good of a politician as he was a soldier.”²² It is interesting that the first historian to credit Cromwell as a shrewd and competent politician was from outside of the British political world. Despite crediting Cromwell as a brilliant politician and a legitimate ruler, to Voltaire this did not mean that he was a good ruler. Voltaire claimed that Cromwell was a dictator who mainly gained and preserved his own power on “every occasion by perpetually abusing it; and the depth of his designs lack nothing of his natural ferocity.”²³ He seemed to have a grudging admiration for Cromwell, but one could never conclude that he respected the Interregnum government as anything but a tyrannical despotism. In concluding the “Oliver Cromwell” section of English history, Voltaire observed that

Never was there king more absolute than Cromwell. He said he liked better to govern under the quality of protector than that of king, because the power of the latter was well known to the people of England, whereas that of a protector was not.²⁴

In Voltaire’s interpretation, it didn’t matter whether one called the Interregnum government a “protectorate”, a “republic,” or a “monarchy,” it was unquestionably and brutally ruled by one man: Oliver Cromwell. What is important about Voltaire’s interpretation is that it did not hinge solely on what he did with the power he had amassed; Voltaire was able to separate and evaluate both Cromwell the leader and politician, and Cromwell the dictator.

The first and most significant historical survey of English political history to be written after the War for Independence was John Millar’s *An Historical View of the English Government*

²¹ Voltaire, *Short Studies in English and American Subjects*.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid.

(1803), which was Millar's survey of the governments that had ruled England for the previous three centuries. Millar's interpretation of Cromwell was highly critical of both the circumstances of his coming to control as well as what he did with that control. Millar wrote that

Had Cromwell possessed less enterprize and abilities, the crown would have been preserved: had his ambition been better directed, England, which under his authority assumed the name of a commonwealth, might have, in reality, obtained a popular government.²⁵

Millar blamed Cromwell for the failure of the republic and the restoration of the monarchy rather than a popularly elected government. He believed that the Parliamentary forces were sincere in their motivations against the tyranny of Charles I, and as such, the failed democratic movement of the 17th century was, in Millar's interpretation, the Lord Protector's fault. He accused Cromwell of having exploited the fact that the British people only had vague notions based on antiquity's republics to wrest control of the nation from the Parliament.²⁶ Millar believed that Cromwell got more "indulgence" and generous remembrance than he rightly deserved, strongly contesting the positive interpretations offered by Blackstone and others.²⁷ The significant point of departure for Millar's view of Cromwell was that Cromwell was to be remembered as a tyrant because of the political deftness he displayed in manipulating Parliament and the Army to suit his own political agenda, rather than because he was an incompetent usurper who had no particular skill in the administration of a government.

By the middle of the 19th century, Whig political writers like Thomas Macaulay had adopted Oliver Cromwell as the "soul" of the political Independent party that was "desirous to erect a commonwealth on the ruins of the old English polity."²⁸ Thomas Macaulay wrote an extensive, multi-volume work, *History of England*, on the political evolution of England since

²⁵ Millar, John. *An Historical View of the English Government*. 1803.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Macauley, Thomas. *History of England Volume I*, 1880, 90.

the ascension of James II, but prefaced this work with an introduction that covered English history all the way back to the Norman Conquest. His decision to begin his exhaustive history with James II is also telling, in the sense that he was essentially choosing to begin with the direct antecedent to the Glorious Revolution and the beginning of the modern English system of a constitutionally limited monarchy, which makes sense given his Whig affiliation. A particularly new claim in Macaulay's history was the general belief that Cromwell was not the despot which had been previously assumed in virtually all historical accounts. Macaulay claimed that Cromwell was astutely aware of and responsive to the desires of the English people and sought to restore the constitution as a means to rule through an appeal to popularity rather than force. He cited as evidence that Cromwell wished to govern more constitutionally, but that absolute dictatorial powers were necessary to keep any semblance of power since neither the Presbyterians nor the Royalists were supportive of his rule.²⁹ Macaulay's Cromwell was a firm, but fair ruler under whom the English citizens prospered. He was also a bestower of unprecedented religious freedom, apparent to Macaulay by the fact that a Jewish synagogue built in London.³⁰

Macaulay's "admirable" history was popular enough to be reprinted in *The Massachusetts Teacher's* 1849 January edition.³¹ The *Massachusetts Teacher* was a publication meant to inform public and home school teachers about issues in education, and the inclusion of Macaulay's excerpt in its publication demonstrates the generally positive reception that Macaulay's interpretation received amongst the New England intellectual circles.

²⁹ Macaulay, *History of England*.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ "Oliver Cromwell", *The Massachusetts Teacher*, Vol. 2, 1849. 29-31.

If Macaulay's interpretation of Oliver Cromwell was positive, then Charles Bradlaugh's short book *Cromwell and Washington: A Contrast (1883)* was just short of worshipful. Bradlaugh waxed poetic about Cromwell the warrior and Cromwell the statesman. He compared Cromwell to a sunset³² and admired his resolve, writing that "Cromwell's will, and Cromwell's sword were alike a metal which bent little and cut through everything."³³ Bradlaugh's comparison was extremely favorable to the Lord Protector and George Washington, in both of whom Bradlaugh presumably found little to be lacking. Responding to a New England criticism that Cromwell was a "hypocrite in his religion, a fanatic in his politics, and a despot in his rule," Bradlaugh conceded that he was a despot, although only because the times had called for it, rebuffed the claim of his fanatic politics by arguing that Cromwell was a monarchist who shunned a kingly title because of the danger of true fanatics, and adopted an agnostic view of Cromwell's religious fanaticism.³⁴ Bradlaugh's book reveals several very important shifts in the historiography of Oliver Cromwell. First, it is apparent that there was a vigorous and increasingly polarized perspective of Cromwell that coexisted simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. Secondly, historians had become increasingly aware of the importance of Cromwell's religious beliefs and were attempting to understand them from a historical, rather than theological perspective. That Cromwell had been influenced by his religious beliefs was not, in and of itself a new perspective. However, Bradlaugh's objective investigation into the extent to which his religious beliefs had influenced Cromwell was new; prior to this, historians had projected their own beliefs about Puritanism onto Cromwell. Voltaire, because of his natural skepticism of religion automatically assumed that Cromwell's beliefs were evidence of an

³² Bradlaugh, Charles. *Cromwell and Washington: A Contrast*. London, 1883. "Still mighty in the fierceness of its rays, few eyes can look steadily into the golden radiance of that evening sun", 41

³³ *Ibid*, 7.

³⁴ *Ibid*, 22.

irrational fanaticism. Witherspoon, because of his positive connection to Puritanism automatically gave Cromwell the status as a saint. Bradlaugh, probably influenced by his atheism, was willing to explore the implications of Cromwell's religious beliefs in a way that was deliberately distanced from his own beliefs.³⁵

At the turn of the 20th century, two British historians became the most important historical writers of English history. Virtually every historiographical survey of 17th century England has to include the works of S.R. Gardiner and C.H. Firth. Gardiner wrote a book titled *Cromwell's Place in History* in 1897, and three years later Firth wrote *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans*. These were not seminal works by either historian but were exclusively dedicated to understanding the role of Cromwell within the 17th century English political system. Gardiner gave little credit to Cromwell as a politician, essentially arguing that he was simply swept along by the actions of Parliament.³⁶ Gardiner went further by claiming that Cromwell had used religious rhetoric as a justification for his foreign wars against the Spanish, but that in reality they had been wars for material gain.³⁷ Most importantly, despite dedicating over one hundred pages to justify his thesis, Gardiner's conclusion about Cromwell was that he was hardly worth a footnote in the narrative of England's history, and that "no single act of the Protectorate. . . was not swept away at the Restoration without hope of revival."³⁸

Firth's interpretation was markedly different. Firth tended to agree with Gardiner that Cromwell was not the most astute politician, noting that Cromwell did not have any definitive plans for the future of England after the execution of Charles I. However, unlike Gardiner, Firth

³⁵ Bradlaugh, 22. "Many great leaders have professed themselves God-sent, and even I, who would always regard such a profession as utterly untrue in fact, am not prepared to say that the utterer is necessarily a hypocrite."

³⁶ Gardiner, S.R. *Cromwell's Place in History*, 1897, 86.

³⁷ *Ibid*, 93.

³⁸ *Ibid*, 104.

believed that Cromwell was a reluctant despot, who had wanted to end his own dictatorship as soon as possible.³⁹ Firth also had a much less cynical approach to Cromwell's religion, and took Cromwell's own words as a serious reflection of his beliefs, and presented him as true believer that he had been divinely ordained to lead England in the events which transpired during the English Civil War and Interregnum Periods.⁴⁰ Firth himself was not a believer in Cromwell's narrative, but he tended to agree with Bradlaugh that regardless of whether or not one was to adopt Cromwell's own view, Cromwell himself was sincere in his beliefs.

One of the first historians to examine Cromwell as more than a political figure was John Buchan, in his 1934 biography, *Oliver Cromwell*. Buchan's work presented the first truly balanced and nuanced version of Cromwell. Buchan presented an interpretation of Cromwell as both a true Puritan and a man who was tormented by his own personal demons and hypocrisy. Buchan also went far afield in his writings about Cromwell, not strictly evaluating Cromwell as a public figure, but also as a private man who was a sportsman and something of an art connoisseur. Buchan ultimately concluded that despite his flaws, that Cromwell was "the first great soldier of the new world."⁴¹

One of the first in-depth investigations into Cromwell's actual political views was accomplished in Barbara S. Feinberg's article "The Political Thought of Oliver Cromwell: Revolutionary or Conservative?" (1968). According to Feinberg, the biggest reason why a comprehensive look into Cromwell's political ideology hadn't been done was because Cromwell's political opportunism was a serious obstacle to the discovery of his actual political

³⁹ Firth, C.H. *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans*, 329.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 331.

⁴¹ P.W.W. "John Buchan's Life of Cromwell: He has Written Excellently about "the One Superman in England Who Ruled and Reigned without a Crown." *New York Times* Oct 28, 1934.

ideology.⁴² In her view, Cromwell was influenced by both ends of the political spectrum in some regard, but that overall “he never aspired to build anew the nation or its institutions” and was essentially a moderate reformer within the more conservative band of politicians.⁴³ Feinberg also agreed with many previous historians that Cromwell was more carried away by the events of the Revolution than that he had participated as an orchestrator of them, and that he had no systematic political philosophy and tended to fall back on his religious ideologies rather than political ones whenever presented with a challenge.

In 1962, C.B. Macpherson published his major work, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* and formally defined the political thought of 17th century England within a Marxist historiographical framework. While Macpherson’s work is one which any historiography would be remiss to leave out due to its significance within political philosophy, the Marxist historian most often cited as the authoritative writer on 17th century England is Christopher Hill. Hill wrote extensively on 17th century England and has been noted by many historians for his serious treatment of the influence of Puritanism. Hill’s many works all discussed Cromwell and the Interregnum to some extent, but it was his 1970 history, *God’s Englishman* that wove the most complex and nuanced view of Cromwell that attempted to fairly account for his own personal complexities. Hill concluded that Cromwell was far from a religious zealot on a personal crusade against Catholicism, and that his primary goal was to gain territory, namely Ireland, for England under the auspices of religious language.⁴⁴ Hill also tends to offer a nuanced view of Cromwell the politician, giving credit both to Cromwell as an individual actor, and also to the shifting political currents of 17th century England.

⁴² Feinberg, Barbara. “The Political Thought of Oliver Cromwell: Revolutionary or Conservative?”, *Social Research* 35, 1968, 445.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 452.

⁴⁴ Christopher Hill. *God’s Englishman*, 1970.

A more traditional Marxist perspective is typified in Neil Faulkner's "The First Wave of Bourgeois Revolutions," (2013) which was a chapter summary of the events of the English Civil War in a comprehensive overview of the Marxist interpretation of the progression of history. Faulkner's summary of the revolutionary period gives almost no attention to the personal motivations or actions of Cromwell, and chooses to focus almost exclusively on the actions of various groups, for which Cromwell is only a representative figure of the Independent Parliamentary political group who "vacillated between compromise and revolutionary action."⁴⁵ There is a cursory nod to Cromwell's religious motivations⁴⁶ but for the whole, Faulkner interprets Cromwell's actions as ultimately aimed at the preservation of the interests of the propertied individuals and capitalist class within England against both the extreme absolute monarchists on the Right and the democratic Levellers on the Left. Faulkner's work is not significant or authoritative in defining a Marxist interpretation of Cromwell as much as it is a representative work. What is worth noting is that Marxists do view 17th century England as a topic worthy of specific study.

In 2010, Irish historian John Cunningham wrote an important article called "Oliver Cromwell and the 'Cromwellian' Settlement of Ireland" in which he challenged the traditionally held historiographical narrative of Irish historians that Cromwell was not only the orchestrator of the Catholic massacres of the early 1650's, but that it was solely because of him. After acknowledging the historiographical challenges presented to Irish historians, Cunningham used letters that Cromwell often wrote to intervene on the behalf of Irish Catholics to conclude that Cromwell was actually a lot more of an advocate for the Irish Catholics than has been

⁴⁵Neil Faulkner, *A Marxist History of the World: From Neanderthals to Neoliberals*, (London, Pluto Press, 2013), 109.

⁴⁶*Ibid*, 108-109.

traditionally assumed, that he took a personal interest in some's plights. Cunningham concluded that "we can detect the sympathetic voice of the 'personal Cromwell'" in his letters.⁴⁷

Cromwell remains one of the most complicated figures of history, in large part because of the complexity of the events surrounding the English Civil War and the political and religious implications of those events. He continues to be interpreted as much by the biases of the beholder as by the burden of historical evidence, in part because the man and his own motivations were so complex. The bi-polar interpretations of Cromwell as hero and villain are reflected in modern Britain which still has no commonly held idea of how best to remember the Lord Protector. The undersized museum dedicated to Cromwell was almost closed recently, and the country only opened its first museum dedicated to the Civil War in 2015.⁴⁸ George V rejected repeated petitions by Churchill to christen a warship named after Cromwell despite the fact that Cromwell is almost universally given credit by historians for his brilliant military leadership and establishment of the modern British Navy, and no statue paid for with public funds has ever been erected.⁴⁹ Due to the politically and ideologically charged nature of the time in which Cromwell lived, and his central role in the events, it seems likely that historians will continue to struggle with interpreting Cromwell through the lens of their own views of limited government.

⁴⁷ Cunningham, John. "Oliver Cromwell and the 'Cromwellian' Settlement of Ireland." *The Historical Journal*, 2010. 934.

⁴⁸ Rees, John. "Through the Glass Darkly," *History Today*, 2018.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

Bibliography

- Adams, John. *A Letter to John Jebb*. London, 1785.
- Adams, John. *A Letter to William Tudor Quincy* June 8, 1818.
- Blackstone, William. *Commentaries on the Laws of England: In Four Books Vol. 1*. Philadelphia, J.B. Lippenscott Company, 1893.
- Bradlaugh, Charles. *Cromwell and Washington: A Contrast*. London, Freethought Pub. Co., 1883.
- Cunningham, John. "Oliver Cromwell and the 'Cromwellian' Settlement of Ireland." *The Historical Journal* 53, no. 4 (2010): 919-37.
- Feinberg, Barbara S. "The Political thought of Oliver Cromwell: Revolutionary or Conservative?" *Social Research* 35, no. 3 (1968): 445-65.
- Gordon, Thomas. "No. 39. Saturday, July 29, 1721. Of the Passions; that they are all alike good or all alike evil, according as they are applied." In *Cato's Letters, vol. 2 June 24, 1721 to March 3, 1722*. n.d.
- Hill, Christopher. *God's Englishman*, London, Penguin Books, 1997.
- Macauley, Thomas. *History of England, Volume I*. London, D. Appleton & Co., 1880.
- Mayhew, Jonathan. "A Discourse Concerning Unlimited Submission and Non-Resistance to the Higher Powers." Boston, 1750.
- "Oliver Cromwell." *The Massachusetts Teacher (1848-1855)*2, no. 1 (1849): 29-31.
- Millar, John. *An Historical View of the English Government*. Indianapolis, Liberty Fund, 1803.
- P.W.W. "John Buchan's Life of Cromwell: He has Written Excellently about "the One Superman in England Who Ruled and Reigned without a Crown." *Oliver Cromwell*. by John Buchan. 458 Pp. Illustrated. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. \$4.50. Buchan's Life of Cromwell." *New York Times* Oct 28, 1934. 2
- Rees, John. "Through the Glass Darkly." *History Today* 68, no. 8 (August 2018), 71-77.
- Smith, Adam. "Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms." Lecture, University of Glasgow, 1763.
- Trenchard, John. *A Collection of Tracts Volume I*. London, Middle Temple Gate, 1751.

Voltaire, *Short Studies in English and American Subjects from The Works of Voltaire*, Vol. XIX, translated by William F. Flemming (New York, 1901), 1733.

Webster, Noah. "The Revolution in France." Speech, New York, 1794.

Witherspoon, John. "Dominion of Providence over the Passions of Men." Speech, Princeton, 1776.