**WHY DID BOTH THE RUMP AND THE BAREBONES FAIL TO PROVIDE A BASIS FOR PERMANENT REPUBLICAN RULE?**

**INTRO**

**The Rump & BB Parl failed to establish permanent Repub rule because of contradictory & incompatible beliefs and expectations held by MPs, civilians and the army. Many conservative MPs, and moderates in the counties, had very little Republican conviction at all and wanted minimum reform and freedoms as these, they believed, would inevitably lead to social, religious and political instability. For the army, Republican rule had to mean a godly reformation: social, political and, above all, religious reform. Cromwell’s aims of ‘healing and settling’ and ‘godly reformation’ were mutually exclusive and it was arguably impossible for any regime to find a compromise that would please both radicals and conservatives. The Rump, made up of MPs who had remained after PP in December 1648 and many who had left Parl before the execution, failed because it was too conservative and disappointed the expectations of the army and Cromwell. In 1653, the BB Parl, dominated by a minority of vociferous radicals, replaced the Rump and pursued godly reform which alarmed many moderates. Neither regime, nor Cromwell, was able to find the balance between reform & settling that would ensure political stability in the Republic.**

* **Is this a road map? What is the argument put forward?**
* **Does it answer the question?**
* **Can you see how the essay will unfold?**

**CONC**

**A basis for permanent Repub rule had not been established by 1653 because of such factors as the threat from foreign powers and the economic climate. However, the divisions between conservatives and radicals, the incompatible demands for rapid godly reform as well as stability, and the nature of the Rump & BB regimes were the most important factors. The Rump and BB failed for different reasons; one was too conservative, the other appeared too radical, but the problem that undermined the establishment of the Republic was the same for both. In 1649 and 1653 it was impossible to allow the freedoms & reforms that radicals demanded without compromising the traditional social hierarchy, control & authority of Church and State that the conservatives wanted to maintain. Cromwell himself wanted freedom of conscience but not the social equality or extended franchise that some groups, such as the Levellers, demanded. Cromwell pursued these aims doggedly during the Protectorate but found that ‘permanent republic rule’ remained elusive throughout, and with hindsight we can see that this was not due to defects in the individual regimes, but to the ambitious, idealistic and essentially incompatible aims that drove them.**

* **Is there a judgement here? A sense of summing up?**
* **Is it still clear what the argument is?**